



**800 MHz TRANSITION ADMINISTRATOR, LLC
QUARTERLY PROGRESS REPORT
FOR THE QUARTER ENDED DECEMBER 31, 2005**

FEBRUARY 22, 2006

John Bush, Managing Director

BearingPoint, Inc.
1676 International Drive
McLean, VA 22102
T: 703.747.8793
M: 703.628.2874

John.Bush@BearingPoint.com

Brett Haan, Managing Director

BearingPoint, Inc.
1676 International Drive
McLean, VA 22102
T: 703.747.4968
M: 202.360.9616

Brett.Haan@BearingPoint.com

Robert B. Kelly, Partner

Squire, Sanders & Dempsey L.L.P.
1201 Pennsylvania Ave., NW
Washington, DC 20044
T: 202.626.6216
F: 202.626.6780

rkelly@ssd.com

Douglas L. Povich, Partner

Squire, Sanders & Dempsey L.L.P.
8000 Towers Crescent Dr. 14th Floor
Tysons Corner, VA 22182
T: 703.720.7888
F: 703.720.7801

dpovich@ssd.com

Alan J. (Joe) Boyer, President

Baseline Telecom, Inc.
2770 Arapahoe Road, Suite 132 - 133
Lafayette, CO 80026
T: 303.444.1480
888.361.0603

JBoyer@BaselineTelecom.com

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
OVERVIEW	1
I. RECONFIGURATION PROGRESS	4
A. Status of Negotiations Wave 1, Stage 1 (Channels 1–120)	4
B. Status of Negotiations for Waves 2 – 4 (Stage 1).....	5
1. Wave 2, Stage 1 (Channels 1–120).....	5
2. Wave 3, Stage 1 (Channels 1–120).....	6
3. Wave 4, Stage 1 (Channels 1–120).....	6
C. Status of Negotiations for Wave 1, Stage 2 (NPSPAC).....	7
D. Planning Funding.....	7
E. Status of Reconfiguration Completion Certifications	8
F. Schedule Management.....	8
G. Special Reconfiguration Considerations.....	10
H. Elections	11
I. Actions Necessary to Improve Reconfiguration Process.....	12
J. Conclusion	14
II. KEY RECONFIGURATION DATA	15
A. Licenses to Be Reconfigured	15
B. Reconfiguration FCC Applications	16
C. Frequency Proposals.....	16
D. Reconfiguration Progress during January 2006	18
E. Frequency Reconfiguration Agreement Review	19
III. COMMUNICATIONS WITH STAKEHOLDERS	20
A. Stakeholder Inquiries	20
B. TA-Produced Materials.....	22
C. Outreach Events and TA-Sponsored Education and Training	23
IV. FINANCIAL	25
A. Reconfiguration Expenditures.....	25
B. Letters of Credit.....	25
C. Payment Process.....	25
D. 800 MHz Incumbent Reviews	25

TABLE OF CONTENTS

(continued)

	Page
E. External Auditor Selection.....	26
F. Transition Administrator	26
1. Fees, Expenses and Staffing	26
2. Disclosure of Non-Reconfiguration Fees.....	26
 APPENDIX 1:	
Status of Frequency Reconfiguration Agreement Negotiations for Licensees in Channels 1-120: Milestones Completed by Number of Frequency Reconfiguration Agreements, Per Wave, Per Region, as of December 31, 2005	
 APPENDIX 2:	
Status of Reconfiguration for Licensees in Channels 1-120: Milestones Completed by Number of Call Signs, Per Wave, Per Region, as of December 31, 2005	
 APPENDIX 3:	
Entities Filing Expansion Band Elections as of January 24, 2006	
 APPENDIX 4:	
Call Sign-Related Reconfiguration Information, as of December 31, 2005	
 APPENDIX 5:	
Status of Reconfiguration Contract Review, Per Wave, Per Region, as of December 31, 2005	
 APPENDIX 6:	
Status of Frequency Reconfiguration Agreement Negotiations for Licensees in Channels 1-120: Milestones Completed by Number of Frequency Reconfiguration Agreements, Per Wave, Per Region, as of January 28, 2006	
 APPENDIX 7:	
Status of Reconfiguration for Licensees in Channels 1-120: Milestones Completed by Number of Call Signs, Per Wave, Per Region, as of January 28, 2006	
 APPENDIX 8:	
Stakeholder Outreach Activities: Meetings and Conferences Attended by TA Representatives, For Quarter Ended December 31, 2005	
 APPENDIX 9:	
800 MHz Transition Administrator Fees, LLC and Expenses through December 31, 2005	

OVERVIEW

800 MHz Transition Administrator, LLC (“TA”) provides its Quarterly Progress Report to the Federal Communications Commission (“FCC”) regarding the progress of the reconfiguration of the 800 MHz band for the quarter ended December 31, 2005, with certain reconfiguration status information presented as of January 28, 2006 and February 21, 2006. Pursuant to the FCC’s *Reconfiguration Orders*,¹ the TA,² as the manager of the reconfiguration effort, is required to report on a quarterly basis the progress of band reconfiguration.³

At the conclusion of the first six months of band reconfiguration, the TA reports that significant progress has been made against the goals of the program. Further, although there were many challenges and lessons learned during this initial period, the TA finds that the reconfiguration process is largely working as intended by the FCC. However, in looking at what lies ahead in 2006, the TA also believes that all stakeholders must intensify their efforts if the program is to remain on schedule.

The program reached two significant milestones in the reconfiguration schedule in 2005. First, the mandatory negotiation period for Wave 1 Stage 1 – that is, the clearing of Channels 1-120 (806/809 MHz and 851/854 MHz), which is used mostly by commercial enterprises – ended on December 26, 2006 with 172 out of a total 369⁴ licensee agreements being referred to

¹ *Improving Public Safety Communications in the 800 MHz Band*, Report and Order, Fifth Report and Order, Fourth Memorandum Opinion and Order, and Order, 19 FCC Rcd 14969 (2004) (“*Report and Order*”); as amended by *Erratum*, WT Docket No. 02-55 (rel. Sept. 10, 2005); *Second Erratum*, 19 FCC Rcd 19651 (2004); *Public Notice*, “Commission Seeks Comment on *Ex Parte* Presentations and Extends Certain Deadlines Regarding the 800 MHz Public Safety Interference Proceeding,” 19 FCC Rcd 21492 (2004); *Third Erratum*, 19 FCC Rcd 21818 (2004); Supplemental Order and Order on Reconsideration, 19 FCC Rcd 25120 (2004) (“*Supplemental Order*”); *Erratum*, WT Docket No. 02-55 (rel. Jan. 19, 2005); Memorandum Opinion and Order, 20 FCC Rcd 16015 (2005) (“*Memorandum Opinion and Order*”) (collectively “*Reconfiguration Orders*”).

² 800 MHz Transition Administrator, LLC is the TA for the reconfiguration of the 800 MHz band mandated by the FCC. 800 MHz Transition Administrator, LLC has contracted with BearingPoint, Inc. (“BearingPoint”), Squire, Sanders & Dempsey L.L.P. (“SSD”) and Baseline Telecom, Inc. (“BTI”) (each a “TA Member” and collective “TA Members”) to perform the duties of the TA.

³ 47 C.F.R. § 90.676(b)(3). In the *Report and Order*, the FCC specified that quarterly progress reports are to include the TA’s expenses and salary. *Report and Order*, 19 FCC Rcd at 15123, ¶ 327. However, this requirement does not appear in Rule 90.676(b)(3). Nonetheless, the TA intends to provide this information in each quarterly progress report. See Appendix 9.

⁴ Note that the number of deals to be completed can vary up or down over time (and therefore from one quarterly progress report to the next) as determined by discussions between parties over the particular assets involved in each deal.

Alternative Dispute Resolution (“ADR”). While this was clearly a large number, this was also the largest Wave by far in terms of the number of agreements to be completed. Additionally, the first use of these new and untested processes probably contributed to the large number of agreements going to ADR. Despite these challenges, as of February 21, 2006 parties successfully reached resolution in 152 cases during ADR; 14 cases were granted additional time to complete mediation, leaving only six cases to be referred to the Commission. All parties are to be commended for the tremendous effort put forth to achieve this result. When combined with progress made in other waves, the TA finds that, as of February 21, 2006, 47 percent of all Channels 1-120 agreements have reached resolution. The TA believes this progress is commensurate with expectations at this stage of the program.

The second milestone at the end of 2005 was the FCC’s Public Notice on December 30, 2005 announcing that the voluntary negotiation period for Wave 1 Stage 2 – that is, the migration of Public Safety’s NPSPAC channel users to the spectrum previously occupied by users of Channels 1-120 – would begin on February 1, 2006.⁵ Once again, Wave 1 is the largest of the four reconfiguration Waves, with an estimated 420 agreements to be completed between Sprint Nextel and Public Safety agencies. These agreements generally will be larger and more complex than those negotiated with commercial enterprises in Channels 1-120. Pursuant to the FCC’s letter to the TA dated January 31, 2006,⁶ the TA is currently evaluating whether adjustments to the reconfiguration schedule are warranted. Regardless of any proposed schedule modifications, the TA emphasizes that it is critical that parties adhere to their assigned Waves’ defined negotiation periods. Perhaps the most significant lesson learned from the past eight months is that *negotiations between parties must begin as soon in the process as possible*. Early and frequent dialogue is essential to framing the key issues to be resolved and to ensuring that adequate time is available in the schedule to resolve them. Recognizing that the first 90 days of negotiations are voluntary, all parties, including the TA, must do their part to engage and advance the negotiation process. Applying other lessons learned, parties can further improve the process going forward as follows:

Sprint Nextel

- Ensure there are sufficient resources to concurrently address negotiations in both NPSPAC and Channels 1-120 and engage licensees on a timely basis.
- Appreciate the unique concerns of Public Safety licensees and the challenges they will face during reconfiguration.
- Be responsive to requests for Planning Funding.

⁵ *Public Notice*, “Wireless Telecommunications Bureau Announces That 800 MHz Band Reconfiguration For NPSPAC Channels Will Commence February 1, 2006, For NPSPAC Regions Assigned to Wave 1,” WT Docket No. 02-55, DA 05-3348 (rel. Dec. 30, 2005) (“*Wave 1 NPSPAC Public Notice*”).

⁶ Letter from Catherine W. Seidel, Acting Chief, Wireless Telecommunications Bureau, to Robert B. Kelly, Esq., 800 MHz Transition Administrator, LLC, WT Docket No. 02-55, DA 06-201 (rel. Jan. 31, 2006) (“January 31, 2006 FCC Letter”).

Licensees

- Be proactive in commencing discussions with Sprint Nextel. While many licensees have done their part, there have been some licensees that refuse to actively engage in the process. Such positions are neither realistic nor in keeping with the spirit of cooperation essential to completing the program on schedule. Not actively engaging in the process and/or waiting will delay completing the program on schedule.
- Be an active participant in the negotiation process, even when consultants or vendors are providing significant assistance. Ultimately, the responsibility for a licensee's agreement and its associated obligations and representations rests with the licensee.
- Verify that both internal costs and those of vendors are reasonable and prudent and the minimum necessary to achieve comparable facilities, *i.e.* treat the funds expended as if they were your own. Excessive cost claims cause delay. The TA is aware of some instances where requested planning costs have exceeded the expected cost of the actual retune.

Public Safety

- Immediately engage at the outset of the voluntary negotiation window, as public safety agreements take longer to complete and implementation generally takes longer to plan.
- If Planning Funding is required, do not wait until the mandatory negotiation period commences. This is too late in the process. Remember that the TA's 75-day planning window is only a guideline, not a rule, and exceptions are expected. Ultimately you should determine what is required for your situation and act accordingly.
- Commit to the process even if you believe interference has not been a significant issue for your agency. Band reconfiguration is for the betterment of Public Safety communications nationwide and delay by one agency has the potential to negatively affect many others.
- Recognize that your reconfiguration may have a cascading effect on other Public Safety agencies, and the program must accommodate all stakeholders.

Transition Administrator

For its part, the TA recognizes the need to take a more active role as follows:

- Proactively communicate with licensees to ensure they are both getting the answers they need to move forward and are taking the steps necessary to adhere to the schedule.
- More closely monitor the status of negotiations, providing clear guidance and encouraging earlier mediation where needed (protracted negotiations over minutiae serves little purpose and possibly extends timelines and costs).
- Set and enforce a 60-day goal on the negotiation of Planning Funding agreements. The TA has already announced a revised process for Planning Funding designed to ensure greater timeliness and responsiveness.

The TA greatly appreciates all of the feedback it has received both directly and indirectly from stakeholders and will continue to use this feedback to improve the process. 2006 will be a critical year for the reconfiguration program and it will take the concerted efforts of all stakeholders, vendors and the TA to maintain the program's aggressive pace.

I. RECONFIGURATION PROGRESS

Since the program commenced on June 27, 2005, there has been good progress in the 800 MHz band reconfiguration program. The process is largely working as designed by the FCC in the *Report and Order* and implemented by the TA. In this section of the Quarterly Progress Report, the TA will summarize the status of negotiations as of the quarter ended December 31, 2005 (with a snapshot of progress through the publication of this report), discuss issues identified during the first eight months of this three year program and describe process changes and other specific actions the TA has taken to address issues identified to date.

A. Status of Negotiations Wave 1, Stage 1 (Channels 1-120)

Through December 31, 2005, nearly 30 percent of Channels 1-120 agreements in all Waves had reached agreement with Sprint Nextel regarding their system reconfiguration. By February 21, 2006, (the conclusion of Wave 1, Stage 1 ADR), this total increased to 47 percent through February 21, 2006.

Reconfiguration commenced on June 27, 2005, with voluntary negotiations for Channels 1-120 licensees in Wave 1, Stage 1. The voluntary and mandatory negotiation periods for Wave 1, Stage 1 (Channels 1-120) licensees, as described in the TA's Regional Prioritization Plan ("RPP"),⁷ concluded in this quarter. Wave 1, Stage 1 (Channels 1-120) licensees are primarily small commercial, conventional systems that must be cleared from Channels 1-120 before NPSPAC public safety systems can be addressed.

Each Wave has three main components for negotiations: (1) a three month voluntary negotiation period; (2) a three month mandatory negotiation period that is followed by; (3) Alternative Dispute Resolution ("ADR") if Sprint Nextel and the licensee have not completed a Frequency Reconfiguration Agreement ("FRA") by the end of the mandatory negotiation period.

As of December 27, 2005, Wave 1, Stage 1 (Channels 1-120) licensees and Sprint Nextel who had not completed an FRA entered into the ADR process. The TA opened 172 mediation dockets (or "cases") including 63 Public Safety licensees, on this date. In its Quarterly Progress Report for the quarter ended September 30, 2005, the TA indicated that it believed that "there will be a significant number of incomplete agreements at the end of the Wave 1 mandatory negotiation period on December 26, 2005."⁸ While this was clearly a significant number, this was also the largest Wave by far in terms of the number of agreements to be completed, and the

⁷ Regional Prioritization Plan of the 800 MHz Transition Administrator, WT Docket No. 02-55 (filed Jan. 31, 2005) ("RPP").

⁸ 800 MHz Transition Administrator, LLC's Quarterly Progress Report for the Quarter Ended September 30, 2005, WT Docket No. 02-55 (filed Nov. 10, 2005) at 1.

TA believes that the “newness” of the process likely had some impact. Detailed tables providing the status of reconfigurations, in terms of both by the number of FRAs per Region per Wave, and the number of call signs per Region per Wave are attached in Appendices 1 and 2, respectively.

The ADR period for Wave 1, Stage 1 (Channels 1-120) licensees began on December 27, 2005, and ended on February 8, 2006. In anticipation of the formal start of ADR, the TA developed, published and, in response to stakeholder comment, refined an ADR Plan governing the mediation process and identified and trained Mediators.

Although substantive disagreements often separated incumbent licensees and Sprint Nextel, the need for many mediations were attributable to the failure of the parties to commence negotiations or exchange information on a timely and regular basis during the voluntary and mandatory negotiation periods. This was especially apparent with regard to the negotiation of Planning Funding Agreements (“PFAs”). The structure provided by mediation expedited the negotiation process, facilitated the exchange of information, and resulted in negotiated agreements between the parties.

Substantive disagreements between licensees and Sprint Nextel frequently involved the costs of reconfiguration. Often, these disputes were attributable to the parties’ failure to exchange detailed information or, when such information was exchanged, to articulate the basis for their disagreement. Other issues presented by the mediations, to a lesser extent than costs, were the comparability of frequencies and equipment, the timing of reconfiguration, and various provisions of the parties’ FRAs.

As of February 21, 2006, 144 mediation dockets had been resolved through the negotiation of FRAs or the cancellation or assignment of licenses; eight resulted in PFAs with FRAs still to be negotiated; 14 were granted additional time to completion mediation; and six were referred to the Chief of the Public Safety and Critical Infrastructure Division for *de novo* review.

In summary, mediation has been successful in expediting the negotiation process between the parties and in resolving contentious issues, which has resulted in numerous Wave 1, Stage 1 (Channels 1 -120) FRAs being submitted to the TA. Through February 21, 2006, approximately 92 percent of affected licensees in Wave 1, Stage 1 (Channels 1-120) had reached agreement with Sprint Nextel regarding their system reconfiguration.

B. Status of Negotiations for Waves 2 – 4 (Stage 1)

In addition to the activities associated with Wave 1, Stage 1 (Channels 1–120) negotiations, other waves and stages have also commenced.

1. Wave 2, Stage 1 (Channels 1–120)

On October 3, 2005, reconfiguration formally began for the 21 NPSPAC Regions in Wave 2, Stage 1 (Channels 1–120, plus a handful of call signs in the southeast ESMR region with frequencies reconfiguring out of the southeastern ESMR band) with the start of the voluntary negotiation period. Wave 2, Stage 1 (Channels 1–120) is well underway and the number of FRAs submitted to date indicates much greater progress compared to that of Wave 1,

Stage 1 (Channels 1–120) at the same point in time. Through December 31, 2005, the TA received 84 completed FRAs for Wave 2, Stage 1 (Channels 1–120) licensees out of an expected total of 232 FRAs.⁹ The TA approved a total of 81 FRAs out of the 84 FRAs submitted; the remaining three FRAs were still under review by the TA as of December 31, 2005, as these were submitted at the end of the quarter. Through January 28, 2006, Sprint Nextel submitted an additional 11 FRAs for Wave 2, Stage 1 (Channels 1–120) licensees. This volume will need to substantially increase during February and March, 2006 in order to avoid a large number of agreements again being referred to ADR. The TA is also working with parties to identify situations where it would be appropriate to begin mediation early.

2. Wave 3, Stage 1 (Channels 1–120)

On January 3, 2006, reconfiguration formally began for the seven NPSPAC Regions in Wave 3, Stage 1 with the start of the voluntary negotiation period. Through December 31, 2005, the TA received and approved 16 completed FRAs for Wave 3, Stage 1 (Channels 1–120 plus the southeastern ESMR band) licensees out of an expected total of 297 FRAs needed to clear the General Category portion of the 800 MHz band. Through January 28, 2006, Sprint Nextel submitted an additional five FRAs for Wave 3, Stage 1 (Channels 1–120) licensees. Wave 3, Stage 1 (Channels 1–120) has a disproportionate number of transactions given the relatively fewer number of NPSPAC Regions assigned to the Wave. This Wave includes the southeastern United States which has an expanded ESMR band plan, which will require that additional licensees be relocated out of the 813.5 to 817/858.5 to 862 MHz ranges as part of Stage 1.¹⁰ This expanded range includes more public safety licensees than in prior Waves, which covered only 806/809 MHz and 851/854 MHz, which is more heavily licensed with commercial entities. The TA believes that parties must be aggressive in reaching agreements and in seeking mediation assistance where appropriate to complete negotiations on schedule.

3. Wave 4, Stage 1 (Channels 1–120)

Through December 31, 2005, the TA received and approved nine completed FRAs for Wave 4, Stage 1 (Channels 1–120) licensees out of an expected total of 156 FRAs needed to clear the General Category portion of the 800 MHz band. Through January 28, 2006, Sprint Nextel submitted an additional three FRAs for Wave 4, Stage 1 (Channels 1–120) licensees.

⁹ Total number of FRAs can change based on how Sprint Nextel structures various agreements with incumbents.

¹⁰ Given that many of the public safety licensees in the ESMR band may also be NPSPAC licensees, the TA in the RPP provided flexibility in negotiating the timing of the actual reconfiguration of ESMR channels (*see* RPP at 33-34). In addition, there is no Guard Band in the southeastern region; however there is an Expansion Band (812.5/857.5 to 813.5/858.5 and 813.0/858.0 to 813.5/858.5 ranges around Atlanta) from which Public Safety licensees will be relocated unless they proactively elect to stay.

C. Status of Negotiations for Wave 1, Stage 2 (NPSPAC)

On December 30, 2005, the FCC released a Public Notice announcing that the 800 MHz band reconfiguration process for NPSPAC channels in the NPSPAC Regions assigned to Wave 1 will start on February 1, 2006, with the commencement of the voluntary negotiation period.¹¹ To support the start of reconfiguration for the largest Public Safety networks, the TA is developing on-line tools and guidelines to assist these licensees.

The reconfiguration of NPSPAC channels does not require frequency planning because every NPSPAC channel will be relocating to the same channel 15 MHz down. Their co-channel environment will be the same following reconfiguration as it was prior to reconfiguration.

However, for schedule management purposes, it will be useful for NPSPAC licensees to be informed of the progress of the relocation of the current occupants of the 1-120 band channels to which they will be relocating. To that end, during the first quarter of 2006 the TA will make available to Wave 1 NPSPAC licensees an online tool that will allow them to review progress on reconfiguring Channels 1-120 specifically impacting their call signs. The TA will also be releasing periodic progress reports on a regional basis on the progress of Channels 1-120 reconfigurations.

Once again, Wave 1 NPSPAC is the largest of the four reconfiguration waves, with an estimated 420 agreements to be completed between Sprint Nextel and Public Safety agencies. These agreements generally will be larger and more complex than those negotiated with commercial enterprises in Channels 1-120, and per the FCC's letter to the TA dated January 31, 2006, the TA is currently evaluating whether adjustments to the reconfiguration schedule are warranted.

D. Planning Funding

The Request for Planning Funding (RFPF) process continued to be a major area of concern this quarter. Licensees, particularly those representing Public Safety, reported significant frustration with the lack of progress in disbursing Planning Funding. The most common frustration expressed to the TA by licensees was a lack of responsiveness on the part of Sprint Nextel. For its part, Sprint Nextel expressed difficulty with obtaining a reasonable level of detail for the cost of planning activities, particularly those involving outside vendors or consultants.

The TA published additional examples of supporting detail and facilitated discussions between parties in the fourth quarter; however 2005 ended without disbursement of planning funds of any significance to Public Safety. Consequently, in January 2006 the TA worked with stakeholders to develop a revised process, designed to ensure greater responsiveness and more timely resolution of negotiations. The TA has adopted a more active oversight role, which will include additional monitoring, and stated timeframes for action to be completed by the parties. During the voluntary negotiation period, if a licensee and Sprint Nextel have not reached an agreement within 60 calendar days from Sprint Nextel's receipt of an RFPF, the TA will

¹¹ *Wave 1 NPSPAC Public Notice*

recommend that the parties submit to TA mediation. If the parties have entered the mandatory negotiation period, then TA mediation will be mandatory. The TA has also provided the following supporting education:

- Conducted a series of Webinars to help educate licensees on the RFPF process, reimbursable vs. non-reimbursable costs, the different cost classifications associated with Planning Funding Requests and Cost Estimates, and how licensees should reflect the different cost classifications in their RFPFs and Cost Estimates.
- Conducted in-person presentations for Wave 1 licensees that requested TA assistance and were unable to participate in the scheduled Webinars.
- Educated licensees on their right to request TA Facilitation for situations where they believe TA involvement is required to move the planning funding process forward.

The TA also notes that on February 14, 2006 Sprint Nextel and the Utah Communications Agency Network (“UCAN”), a large Public Safety system in Wave 1 serving 115 agencies with over 200 channels across the State of Utah, entered into a Planning Funding Agreement, using the key components of the TA’s template for planning funding. Combined with the revised process, it is expected that this agreement will help the pave the way for resolving future requests in a more timely manner.

E. Status of Reconfiguration Completion Certifications

Given the schedule benchmark in the FCC’s *Report and Order* specifying that 20 NPSPAC Region shall have completed the clearing of Channels 1-120 within the first 18 months of reconfiguration (*i.e.* through the end of December 2006), and the number of deals the TA knows are in progress, the TA expects that the number of completion certifications submitted will rise sharply in the coming months. Through December 31, 2005, Sprint Nextel submitted to the TA certifications signifying completion of reconfiguration for five FRAs. An additional eight certifications were submitted to the TA in January 2006. The TA has:

- Reviewed and certified as complete seven reconfigurations, pending any results of the TA’s post-close review rights or external audits;
- Requested information from Sprint Nextel on three of the reconfiguration certifications seeking clarification to allow the TA to complete its review.
- The three remaining reconfiguration certifications were being reviewed by the TA as of January 28, 2006.

F. Schedule Management

In the Report and Order, the FCC created the framework for addressing interference in Public Safety communications. These interference problems threatened the ability of Public Safety licensees to communicate and also to respond to citizens in emergencies, consequently the FCC’s Report and Order appropriately put in place an aggressive schedule to address a complex nationwide problem. The FCC mandated that the TA establish a relocation schedule on a NPSPAC Region-by-Region basis, prioritizing the Regions on the basis of population and

amounts of unacceptable interference.¹² Consistent with this guidance, the TA solicited input from all stakeholders (licensees, associations, vendors, and Sprint Nextel) during the development of the RPP. In drafting the RPP, the TA gave high priority to NPSPAC Regions with larger populations and to NPSPAC Regions that reported high incidences of interference. Acknowledging that complex systems might take longer to reconfigure, the TA recommended starting reconfiguration of such systems at the beginning of the program to ensure that they would be completed within the timeframe required by the FCC. Accordingly, the RPP was designed with regions having large populations subject to reconfiguration in Wave 1,¹³ and Wave 1 is the largest and most complex of all the Stage 1 reconfiguration Waves.

The RPP was filed with the FCC on January 31, 2005 and was approved by the FCC on March 11, 2005.¹⁴ Since the RPP included many large licensees in the first Wave, the TA provided several months advance notice before the official start of Wave 1, Stage 1 in June 2005. Although meeting the Wave 1 schedule has been challenging, there has been significant progress in Wave 1 and the overall reconfiguration program is further ahead than it otherwise would have been if the TA had proposed a less ambitious schedule.

The FCC issued a letter to the TA on January 31, 2006 offering guidance with respect to potential modification of the schedule, in which the FCC provided that the TA has the authority to act upon requests for certain adjustments of the schedule or modification of individual deadlines.¹⁵ The TA believes that the key to completing the program on schedule is for parties to actively engage and successfully negotiate contracts during the negotiation periods. If there are major issues or contingencies (*e.g.*, scheduling concerns) that are impeding negotiations, parties need to identify these issues, and suggested resolutions, to the TA. Unless the parties are engaged, the TA cannot identify solutions to licensees' concerns.

The TA is constantly monitoring the reconfiguration schedule and considering adjustments based on evolving events and program progress to date. All of the schedule adjustments the TA has made, or is considering, are fully consistent with the flexible scheduling plan laid out in the RPP. There are no adjustments under consideration that would extend the overall schedule, or cause the goals and milestones of the program not to be met.¹⁶

The TA is specifically tracking or considering a number of matters including the following:

¹² See *Report and Order*, 19 FCC Rcd at 15072, ¶ 195.

¹³ RPP at 3.

¹⁴ See *Public Notice*, "Wireless Telecommunications Bureau Approves the Basic Reconfiguration Schedule 800 MHz Band Put Forth in the Transition Administrator's 800 MHz Regional Prioritization Plan," WT Docket No. 02-55, DA 05-619 (Mar. 11, 2005)

¹⁵ See January 31, 2006 FCC Letter.

¹⁶ Schedule management is consistent with the TA's responsibilities as set forth in the *Report and Order* and as clarified by the January 31, 2006 FCC Letter.

- The impact on the program schedule of the Economic Area (“EA”) re-election on Public Safety Regions with significant numbers of EA licensed frequencies held by incumbents other than Nextel or Southern Company.¹⁷
- The TA is reviewing potential schedule or program modifications to ensure that reconfiguration of NPSPAC channel licensees in Wave 1 and 2 will not be affected/impacted by geographic proximity to licensees in other Waves on 806/851 MHz to 809/854 MHz channels that have not yet relocated.
- Clarifying the RPP to set specific dates for the start of the NPSPAC channel negotiation periods for Wave 2 and 3. This would update the “PN Window” in the RPP wherein individual NPSPAC Regions would start on different dates within the windows to set a definitive start date for negotiations for all Regions in the Wave.
- Reviewing the potential impact of 806/851 to 809/854 MHz licensees requesting delays in their reconfiguration, which would push their implementation into the timeframes allotted for NPSPAC channel reconfiguration. These delays can be the result of several circumstances, including:
 - o Public Safety agencies requesting concurrent reconfiguration of Channels 1-120 and NPSPAC channels;
 - o Delays in negotiating agreements that affect reconfiguration implementation; and
 - o The need for licensees to coordinate reconfiguration with related licensees that have not yet completed negotiations.

Mitigation of these types of delays may take several forms, including requiring Channels 1-120 licensees to notify and coordinate with NPSPAC channel licensees and take into account schedule management contingencies in FRAs. As noted below, a critical modification to Motorola software for radios and controllers has been completed ahead of schedule, which will allow those licensees with combined Channels 1-120 and NPSPAC channels systems to move forward more quickly than previously anticipated.

G. Special Reconfiguration Considerations

Motorola Firmware Update

During this quarter, Motorola completed the final milestone of its development of rebanding radio software. This software will allow hundreds of thousands of radios to be reprogrammed rather than replaced. In January 2006, the TA participated in the review of this

¹⁷ On February 3, 2006, the TA amended the RPP by moving Puerto Rico and the U.S. Virgin Islands (NPSPAC Regions 47 and 48 respectively) from Wave 2 to Wave 3. See 800 MHz Transition Administrator’s *Ex Parte* Notification, WT Docket No. 02-55 (filed Feb. 3, 2006). The TA determined that there are unique and complex spectrum issues in Puerto Rico and the U.S. Virgin Islands that were affected by the FCC’s *Memorandum Opinion and Order* that required this amendment of the RPP. The call sign and contract information will be adjusted in the first quarter 2006 Quarterly Progress Report to adjust for this schedule change and any others that may occur in the quarter.

Milestone #6 regarding “Completion and Acceptance of Certification Testing” for the software. This milestone had originally been scheduled for completion by April 2006.

Motorola announced in January 2006 that it has begun shipping subscriber and infrastructure products containing the new software. Motorola is now demonstrating the software to its licensee customers and third-party consultants. Remaining activities include developing the infrastructure reconfiguration Method of Procedure, creating training materials, and planning customer field testing.

Several licensees have expressed concern that the lack of a timely release of Motorola testing software would infringe on their ability to complete testing within the designated timeframe. Given that Motorola released the software ahead of schedule in January 2006, the TA believes testing can be successfully completed within the available time period of almost 24 months for Wave 1 NPSPAC licensees and users.

Interoperability

To further support the reconfiguration of Public Safety systems, the TA laid the foundation in this quarter for a working group to focus on mutual aid and interoperability issues. A preliminary process of defining issues and questions regarding mutual aid and interoperability is underway. The TA anticipates meeting with key constituents in the licensee and vendor communities during the first half of 2006 to establish recommendations and guidelines for maintaining critical communications during reconfiguration.

H. Elections

Economic Area (“EA”) Elections

The FCC’s Memorandum Opinion and Order made certain rule changes and clarifications affecting the relocation of licensees to the ESMR Band. The FCC directed the TA to open a 20-day filing window for EA licensees to file new elections or modifications to previous elections to relocate to or remain in the ESMR Band. Accordingly, in a January 11, 2006 Press Release, the TA announced that the 20-day filing window would open on January 18, 2006 and that the last day of the filing window would be February 6, 2006.¹⁸ The reconfiguration of certain Wave 1 EA licensees was delayed pending the conclusion of the EA re-election process.

Guard Band Elections

The TA has received eight Guard Band election filings thus far in response to the TA’s June 29, 2005 Press Release announcing that incumbent licensees subject to mandatory relocation (operating on frequencies between 806-809 MHz/851-854 MHz) could elect to move

¹⁸ See 800 MHz Transition Administrator, LLC’s *Ex Parte* Notification, WT Docket No. 02-55 (filed Jan. 11, 2006) (attaching Press Release announcing election deadline); see also http://www.800TA.org/content/news/2006/01_11_06.asp.

to the Guard Band.¹⁹ The deadline for submitting Guard Band election filings was July 20, 2005 for Wave 1, October 3, 2005 for Wave 2, and January 3, 2006 for Wave 3, and is April 3, 2006 for Wave 4 licensees.

Expansion Band Elections

The TA has received 61 Expansion Band election filings through January 24, 2006 in response to its June 28, 2005 Press Release announcing that incumbent Public Safety licensees could elect to remain in the Expansion Band.²⁰ The deadline for submitting Expansion Band election filings was September 27, 2005 for Wave 1 and January 3, 2006 for Wave 2, and is April 3, 2006 for Wave 3 and July 3, 2006 for Wave 4 licensees. During the quarter ending December 31, 2005, the TA granted three requests for an extension of time to submit an Expansion Band election filing. The list of entities filing Expansion Band elections appears in Appendix 3.

I. Actions Necessary to Improve Reconfiguration Process

As noted previously, significant progress has been made in the first eight months of the program. As would be expected, there have also been significant challenges and lessons learned. Perhaps the most significant lesson learned is that negotiations between parties must begin as soon in the process as possible. Early and frequent dialogue is essential to framing the key issues to be resolved and to ensuring that adequate time is available in the schedule to resolve them. Recognizing that the first 90 days of negotiations are voluntary, all parties, including the TA, must do their part to engage and advance the negotiation process.

Parties can further improve the process going forward as follows:

Sprint Nextel

- Ensure there are sufficient resources to concurrently address negotiations in both NPSPAC and Channels 1-120 and engage licensees on a timely basis.
- Appreciate the unique concerns of Public Safety licensees and the challenges they will face during reconfiguration.
- Be responsive to requests for Planning Funding.

Licensees

- Be proactive in commencing discussions with Sprint Nextel. While many licensees have done their part, there have been some licensees that refuse to actively engage in the process. Such positions are neither realistic nor in keeping with the spirit of

¹⁹ See 800 MHz Transition Administrator, LLC's *Ex Parte* Notification, WT Docket No. 02-55 (filed June 30, 2005) (attaching Press Release announcing election deadline).

²⁰ See *id.*

cooperation essential to completing the program on schedule. Not actively engaging in the process and/or waiting will delay completing the program on schedule.

- Be an active participant in the negotiation process, even when consultants or vendors are providing significant assistance. Ultimately the responsibility for a licensee's agreement and its associated obligations and representations rests with the licensee.
- Verify that both internal costs and those of vendors are reasonable and prudent and the minimum necessary to achieve comparable facilities, i.e. treat the funds expended as if they were your own. Excessive cost claims cause delay. The TA is aware of some instances, for example, where requested planning costs have exceeded the expected cost of the actual retune.

Public Safety

- Immediately engage at the outset of the voluntary negotiation window, as public safety agreements take longer to complete and implementation generally takes longer to plan.
- If Planning Funding is required, do not wait until the mandatory negotiation period commences. This is too late in the process. Remember that the TA's 75-day planning window is only a guideline, not a rule, and exceptions are expected. Ultimately, you should determine what is required for your situation and act accordingly.
- Commit to the process even if you believe interference has not been a significant issue for your agency. Band reconfiguration is for the betterment of Public Safety communications nationwide and delay by one agency has the potential to negatively affect many others.
- Recognize that your reconfiguration may have a cascading effect on other Public Safety agencies, and the program must accommodate all stakeholders.

Transition Administrator

For its part, the TA recognizes the need to take a more active role as follows:

- Proactively communicate with licensees to ensure they are both getting the answers they need to move forward and are taking the steps necessary to adhere to the schedule.
- More closely monitor the status of negotiations, providing clear guidance and encouraging earlier mediation where needed (protracted negotiations over minutiae serves little purpose and possibly extends timelines and costs).
- Set and enforce a 60-day goal on the negotiation of Planning Funding agreements. The TA has already announced a revised process for Planning Funding designed to ensure greater timeliness and responsiveness.

Active Monitoring of Negotiations

The TA is taking steps to reduce the number of incomplete negotiations that may remain when the mandatory negotiation periods conclude in future Waves. The TA is actively monitoring the progress of negotiations by obtaining status updates directly from licensees

through calling campaigns. As a result, the TA has identified issues impeding progress and developed strategies to resolve such issues. Furthermore, the TA has expanded its direct outreach efforts through the establishment of a Public Safety outreach function staffed with experienced Public Safety communications professionals. This function will increase the TA's previous efforts to work directly within the NPSPAC Regions in each Wave and with specific licensees to facilitate risk mitigation and process education. The TA also meets regularly with the FCC to provide updates regarding the progress of reconfiguration and to seek assistance and guidance for resolving issues that arise in the program.

Request for Planning Funding Process Improvements

As stated above in Section I.D., planning funding for public safety agencies emerged as a critical issue. In November 2005, the TA responded to stakeholder input by refining the RFPF Framework to provide greater clarity and to make the process more efficient. Despite these changes, Public Safety associations and licensees were still experiencing frustration requesting planning funding. The TA met with public safety stakeholder groups and the FCC on several occasions to discuss the RFPF process, challenges and potential improvements.

To resolve licensees' concerns about planning funding and to improve the process, the TA took multiple steps as noted previously in Section I.D. of this Quarterly Progress Report, including implementing a new RFPF process and framework on February 1, 2006. The new RFPF process was created based on input received from Public Safety associations, licensees, and Sprint Nextel. These changes are designed to facilitate swift responsiveness from all entities: the licensee, Sprint Nextel and the TA. The TA believes that the new process will facilitate agreements regarding planning funding on a much faster timeframe, resulting in licensees being able to move forward with their negotiations and associated planning activities.

J. Conclusion

Significant progress has been made in the first eight months of the program in the important first step of negotiating agreements to clear Channels 1-120. This progress was made in the face of significant challenges, not the least of which was the size of the first Wave and the newness of the reconfiguration process. All parties are to be commended for their efforts in this area. This period also yielded important lessons learned, most important of which is that parties must start their negotiations as early as they possibly can within the schedule. The TA greatly appreciates all of the feedback it has received both directly and indirectly from stakeholders and will continue to use this feedback to improve the process. Looking forward to the initiation of NPSPAC channel negotiations, it is also clear that all parties, including the Transition Administrator, must intensify their efforts to successfully address the challenges ahead and maintain the program's aggressive pace

II. KEY RECONFIGURATION DATA

A. Licenses to Be Reconfigured

Table 1 below provides the TA's analysis of the current population of call signs per wave as defined in the RPP. The primary source of this data is the FCC's Universal Licensing Systems ("ULS") database with geographical augmentation by the TA to determine NPSPAC Region and other reconfiguration-specific information. This data is used to define the population of licenses that need to be addressed in the reconfiguration, and will be updated to reflect changes made to the ULS database.²¹

TABLE 1: CURRENT POPULATION OF CALL SIGNS, PER WAVE

	Channels 1-120	Public Safety Expansion Band	NPSPAC	SE-ESMR ESMR Band	Total
Wave	Number of Call Signs				
Wave 1	852	416	1,467	0	2,735
Wave 2	592	259	539	12	1,402
Wave 3	504	310	743	259	1,816
Wave 4	828	377	1,236	0	2,441
TOTAL	2,776	1,362	3,985	271	8,394

Assumptions

The TA has made certain assumptions regarding the population of licenses to be addressed in reconfiguration. First, for spectrum planning purposes, unless notified otherwise, the TA has assumed that all Public Safety licensees in the Expansion Band will relocate. The number of licensees that will be reconfigured will decrease as the TA receives elections from Public Safety incumbent licensees opting not to reconfigure.²² Through January 24, 2006, the TA has received 61 election filings from Public Safety licensees to stay in the Expansion Band. Second, mobile-only systems and other secondary licenses (itinerant, demonstration and temporary) are not generally being reconfigured in bands other than the NPSPAC channels. Third, licenses under contract for voluntary reconfiguration agreements prior to May 27, 2005 for which Sprint Nextel will not be seeking credit are not included in the totals. Fourth, the call sign figures in this report include only active call signs. The current population of call signs will be reduced by any call signs that cancel without an FRA; it will also be increased for new call

²¹ Table 1 includes site-specific (non-EA) call signs with fixed locations above 851 MHz. It does not include Sprint Nextel or SouthernLINC call signs. There are a number of ancillary call signs licensed in the 806-824 MHz range that are not included in the counts but will, however, be reconfigured in association with related call signs that are included in the counts. See Appendix 4 for more detailed data.

²² Appendix 3 contains the list of entities that filed Expansion Band election elections through January 24, 2006.

signs granted from pending applications. Finally, the TA and Sprint Nextel have jointly defined milestones to track the status of ongoing reconfiguration activities at the licensee level.

B. Reconfiguration FCC Applications

The TA has continually worked with the FCC staff to define and implement data transfers to authenticate reconfiguration related applications. During this quarter, in addition to the site-specific call sign applications noted below, the first three reconfiguration-related applications were filed for Economic Area (“EA”) licenses. Table 2 below summarizes the status of reconfiguration applications for site-specific call signs before the FCC through December 31, 2005.

Table 2: Reconfiguration FCC Application Milestones for Channels 1-120 Call Signs as of December 31, 2005

Public Safety Region	Updated Population as of 12/31/05	Call Signs with Reconfiguration Applications Submitted to FCC	Call Signs with Reconfiguration Applications Granted	Call Signs with Surrender Applications Submitted to FCC	Call Signs with Surrender Applications Granted
	Number of Call Signs				
Wave 1	852	217	197	57	51
Wave 2	592	137	131	27	26
Wave 3	504	22	17	4	2
Wave 4	828	17	14	3	3
TOTAL	2776	393	359	91	82

The process defined in conjunction with the FCC and Sprint Nextel for processing reconfiguration related applications is working well. For PMRS applications that do not require public notice the average time from filing to grant is nine calendar days. Applications for SMR systems that may require a 30 day public notice are being granted in 33 calendar days.

Appendix 2 also contains additional information regarding the TA’s reconfiguration FCC application milestones (on a per region basis) as of December 31, 2005.

C. Frequency Proposals

The TA started frequency planning in late April 2005 for Wave 1 and began distributing Frequency Proposal Reports (“FPRs”), containing proposed replacement frequencies and certain co-channel information, to Wave 1 licensees in mid-June 2005. With each subsequent Wave, the majority of FPRs were sent concurrently with the start of the Wave. The majority of Frequency Proposals for Wave 3 Stage 1 (Channels 1-120) and Expansion Band licensees were sent for printing and mailing in late December 2005.

As of December 31, 2005, the TA had analyzed and proposed replacement frequencies for 3,992 Wave 1 frequencies; 1,957 Wave 2 frequencies; 2,482 Wave 3 frequencies and 726 Wave 4 frequencies. A total of 2,978 frequencies were analyzed and proposed in this quarter.

The TA has also sent FPRs for Wave 1, 2 and 3 Public Safety Expansion Band call signs. While Public Safety licensees may elect to remain on their current channels, for planning purposes new frequencies proposals were prepared for all relevant call signs.²³ Most of these Expansion Band frequencies will be reconfigured in the same timeframe as the NPSPAC channels following the clearing of 851-854 MHz, and thus were processed subsequent to 851-854 MHz proposals. Calls signs related to Public Safety licensees that also have 851-854 MHz channels were given priority in anticipation that those licensees would likely be the first to reconfigure out of the Expansion Band.

For each Wave, FPRs for certain call signs were not generated or have been delayed for reasons including the following:

- The call sign is licensed in the Canadian border region.
- The call sign was already under contract prior to the start of reconfiguration.²⁴
- The licensee negotiated a reconfiguration agreement ahead of their Wave and is already under way in their process.
- There are frequency planning decisions and negotiations between Sprint Nextel and incumbents pending the outcome of the EA re-election specified in the FCC's *Memorandum Opinion and Order*.
- There are pending applications to be granted that materially affect technical parameters. (As these applications have been granted, frequency proposals have been sent to the licensee(s).)
- There are unresolved co-channel distance and other technical issues. (As these issues have been resolved, frequency proposals have been processed and sent to the licensee(s).)

²³ As of December 31, 2005, Public Safety licensees had filed elections not to reconfigure for 113 call signs. The total by NPSPAC Region is summarized in Appendix 2.

²⁴ These are call signs already subject to a voluntary reconfiguration contract with Sprint Nextel prior to the May 27, 2005 application freeze for Wave 1, but applications had not yet been granted to remove these frequencies from reconfiguration.

D. Reconfiguration Progress during January 2006

FRA Negotiations and Submissions. Table 3a below provides a summary of the number of FRAs currently under negotiation between Sprint Nextel and incumbent licensees

Table 3a: Status of Reconfiguration for Licensees in Channels 1-120 as of January 28, 2006 (achieved milestones by number of FRAs)²⁵

	Number of Channels 1-120 FRAs	Sprint Nextel Initiated Contact with Licensee	Sprint Nextel and Licensee Reach Verbal Agreement	FRAs Submitted to TA	FRAs Approved by TA	Reconfiguration Certifications Submitted to TA	Reconfiguration Certifications Verified by TA*
Wave	Number of Frequency Reconfiguration Agreements (FRAs)						
Wave 1	369	367	304	258	238	7	2
Wave 2	232	224	132	95	92	4	3
Wave 3	297	208	38	21	19	1	1
Wave 4	156	53	26	12	12	1	1
Wave Undetermined	5	2	4	0	0	0	0
Total:	1059	854	504	386	361	13	7

*Excludes results of TA post-closing review rights or external audit.

Table 3b: Status of Reconfiguration for Licensees in Channels 1-120 as of January 28, 2006 (achieved milestones by number of call signs)

	Number of Channels 1-120 Call signs	Sprint Nextel Initiated Contact with Licensee	Sprint Nextel and Licensee Reach Verbal Agreement	Number of Call signs on FRAs Submitted to TA	Number of Call signs on FRAs Approved by TA	Reconfiguration Certifications verified by TA (call sign number)
Wave	Number of Call signs on FRAs					
Wave 1	852	817	591	501	396	3
Wave 2	592	510	278	230	176	3
Wave 3	504	377	74	53	23	1
Wave 4	828	137	58	27	26	1
Wave Undetermined	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total:	2776	1841	1001	811	621	8

²⁵ Sprint Nextel is the data source for the first three columns. The figures have not been verified by the TA. Total number of FRAs can change based on how Sprint Nextel structures various agreements with licensees.

Reconfiguration FCC Applications. Table 4 below summarizes the status of reconfiguration applications before the FCC through January 28, 2006.

Table 4: Reconfiguration FCC Application Milestones for Channels 1-120 Call Signs as of January 28, 2006

Public Safety Region	Updated Population as of 12/31/05	Call Signs with Reconfiguration Applications Submitted to FCC	Call Signs with Reconfiguration Applications Granted	Call Signs with Surrender Applications Submitted to FCC	Call Signs with Surrender Applications Granted
	Number of Call Signs				
Wave 1	852	300	262	80	63
Wave 2	592	158	145	40	34
Wave 3	504	24	20	5	5
Wave 4	828	22	18	6	3
TOTAL	2776	504	445	131	105

Detailed tables providing the status of reconfigurations – broken out both by the number of FRAs per region per wave, and the number of call signs per Region per Wave – are attached to this report in Appendices 6 and 7, respectively.

E. Frequency Reconfiguration Agreement Review

Table 5 below provides an overview of the elapsed time required by the TA to review and approve FRAs submitted to the TA by Sprint Nextel. Table 6 illustrates the TA's time to review compared to service level targets, on a percentage basis.

Table 5: TA Reconfiguration Contract Review Timeframes (in Business Days) on Approval of FRAs, as of December 31, 2005

	1-5 Days from Receipt	6-10 Days from Receipt	11-15 Days from Receipt	16-20 Days from Receipt	21 Days or More from Receipt	TOTAL
Wave	Number of Frequency Reconfiguration Agreements (FRAs)					
Wave 1	173	8	1	1	0	183
Wave 2	75	4	2	0	0	81
Wave 3	14	2	0	0	0	16
Wave 4	9	0	0	0	0	9
Total For Waves 1-4	271	14	3	1	0	289

Table 6: TA Contract Review Performance (as a percentage) vs. Service Level Targets

Time to Review	Within 5 business days	Within 10 business days	Within 15 business days
Service Levels	80%	95%	100%
TA's Performance	93.77%	98.6%	99.7%

Additional information regarding the status of FRA review (on a per Region, per Wave basis) is attached as Appendix 5.

III. COMMUNICATIONS WITH STAKEHOLDERS

The TA's communications with stakeholders account for both proactive communications initiated by the TA ("Stakeholder Outreach") and responsive communications to inquiries submitted by the affected community. Stakeholder Outreach includes the development and publication of communication materials (print and electronic) designed to disseminate and share information about the 800 MHz band reconfiguration program, the process and the reconfiguration schedule with licensees and other affected stakeholders. In addition to the printed and electronic communications materials, the TA has participated in several conferences and symposia to interact with and educate licensees on the RPP and the reconfiguration program. The TA continues its educational series to further advise licensees on the process and to facilitate access to knowledge sharing opportunities without requiring licensees to travel to conference/symposium locations. This series is delivered via an Internet seminar ("Webinar") format,, which is a cost-effective means to reach affected stakeholders. This multi-pronged Stakeholder Outreach effort enables the TA to address the differing needs of the affected community (by addressing their questions, concerns, and providing them with information to reconfigure their networks) and to facilitate licensee preparation in meeting the requirements of the RPP.

A. Stakeholder Inquiries

As noted in previous reports, the TA has established a "Contact Center" to receive and process questions, requests for information, etc., regarding reconfiguration and the TA's activities. The Contact Center is staffed by call agents trained to answer inquiries or direct callers to the appropriate TA resource for a response. Each inquiry, whether received by e-mail, phone or facsimile, is documented and retained by the Contact Center and tracked until it is resolved. The TA uses industry-standard tools and practices to track all inquiries and manage the Contact Center.

The TA receives inquiries from a variety of stakeholders: licensees, vendors, consultants, associations, and trade press. The TA's policy is to respond to the majority of inquiries within 24 hours of receipt, except in those few instances where a response may require additional research. In this quarter, the TA received a total of 673 inquiries to the Contact Center (290 in October 2005; 160 in November 2005; and 223 in December 2005). This represents a 45 percent increase in the inquiry volume over the previous quarter and is consistent with the increase in active Waves and Stages. In comparison to the previous quarter, it should be noted that the overall inquiry volume per month remained consistent. The data illustrate peaks and valleys in the total volume of inquiries after communications were distributed to licensees, such as the Information Package and Frequency Proposal Report mailings. Access to the Contact Center is a critical component to ensure that licensees and other stakeholders are able to obtain information to prepare for and implement their system(s) reconfiguration.

The Contact Center utilizes the categories and descriptions listed in Table 7 below to classify each stakeholder inquiry for tracking and retaining TA responses:

Table 7: Stakeholder Inquiry Classifications

Category	Description	Inquiry Volume
Reconfiguration & Relocation	Answers to this category of questions describe the basics of reconfiguration.	9.4%
The TA's Core Functions	Answers for this category of questions introduce stakeholders to the TA and describe the basics of the TA's role within for reconfiguration.	25%
Regional Prioritization Plan	Answers for this category of questions introduce the Stakeholders to the plan that the TA is using for reconfiguration.	5.3%
Negotiations	Answers for this category of questions include any question involving the sequence of steps to conclude an agreement with Sprint Nextel.	15.33%
Reconfiguration Planning & Process Guidelines	Answers for this category of questions describe the activities required to perform and complete reconfiguration planning.	10.3%
Frequency Assignments	Answers for this category of questions indicates issues regarding the licensees' new frequency assignments.	13%
Reconfiguration Costs	Answers for this category of questions describe the payment process and address the different payment policies and schedules the TA has established.	12.86%
Logistics/Administrative-Related	Answers for this category of questions include topics such as: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Instructions for filing different TA forms - Request for TA Collateral Materials - Website Assistance - Webinar Assistance - Guidance for Filing FCC Election - Meeting and outreach request 	31.30%
Border Issues	Answers for this category of questions addresses questions about systems in close proximity to the Canada/Mexico border	2.26%
Total		100%

With the increase in inquiries, the Contact Center has also experienced a shift in the types of inquiries it has received. For example, inquiries regarding “negotiation” and “reconfiguration costs” have increased as licensees in Wave 1, Stage 1 (Channels 1-120) have entered ADR and Wave 1, Stage 2 (NPSPAC channels) negotiations began on February 1, 2006. Conversely, the volume of inquiries classified as “reconfiguration planning & process” have decreased in the same period.

B. TA-Produced Materials

In this quarter, the TA continued to distribute informational materials to stakeholders relating to the reconfiguration process, including brochures, fact sheets, licensee forms, TA press releases, and other material, as listed below. Most of these items are posted on the TA's website (www.800TA.org).

Reconfiguration Background and General Information

- **Quick Reference Guide** – A 20-page booklet that provides an overview of the reconfiguration and planning steps for licensees to prepare for relocation, as well as information on the RPP and important contact information. This document was updated during the quarter to include the most current reconfiguration guidance, including information on new TA policies. The Guide has been distributed to all Waves' licensees in the Information Package Mailing (via the points of contact where they were provided, and addresses available in the ULS database). Through the end of the quarter, over 1750 copies have also been distributed at conferences and events during this quarter. An additional 300 were distributed at events through January and February of 2006.
- **Reconfiguration Handbook** – This document provides an overview of reconfiguration, the RPP, reconfiguration phases, and detailed guidance on planning for reconfiguration, as well as TA contact information. Release 1.0 was issued in April 2005 and then updated in June 2005 in Release 1.1. The TA has been working through Q4 to expand and update the Handbook and associated online reference guide (on the TA's website). The new version (Release 2.0) was finalized and posted to the TA's website on February 20, 2006.

Based on input received from licensees and other stakeholders, the TA updated and expanded the Request for Planning Funding ("RFPF") guidance to provide licensees additional support in completing the request for planning funds. The revised RFPF Package includes the following:

- **RFPF Instructions** - Outlines step-by-step instructions to guide licensees in providing the necessary planning and cost details to Sprint Nextel.
- **Sample RFPF Package** – Microsoft Word form outlines the areas that may need to be addressed in the RFPF package and includes placeholders for data to be easily entered and stored. This template is provided to facilitate the development of the RFPF and supporting statement of work ("SOW").
- **Sample RFPF Package** – One "completed" RFPF Form and supporting SOW for a fictional licensee reconfiguring a large/medium system and one for a licensee reconfiguring a small system. The samples serve to provide additional insight into the level of detail expected within the process.

The RFPF Package was updated in January/February 2006 to reflect the TA's updated RFPF Process. In addition, a one-page Fact Sheet was developed and posted to the TA's website to summarize the salient features of this updated process.

Mailings to licensees this quarter included the following

- “Information Package” mailed to Wave 3 licensees on December 15, 2005; included a cover letter, Quick Reference Guide, and POC Form with self-addressed stamped envelope.
- Frequency Proposal Reports mailed to Wave 2, Stage 1 and Wave 3, Stage 1 licensees (Channels 1-120 and Expansion Band). Wave 2, Stage 1 mailings continued from Q3. Wave 3, Stage 1 mailings began on December 22, 2005.
- Day 150 and Day 175 ADR Announcement letters were mailed on December 7, 2005 and December 19, 2005, respectively, to Wave 1, Stage 1 licensees for whom an FRA had not been submitted to the TA. This mailing informed these licensees that they would be entering ADR if they do not have an FRA submitted on their behalf.

Press Releases

The TA released the following press releases in this quarter:

- “800 MHz Transition Administrator Announces the Release of Two New Policies” (October 26, 2005)
- “800 MHz Transition Administrator Announces the Release of New Request for Planning Funding (RFPF) Documents” (November 21, 2005)

www.800TA.org

The TA’s website is a significant component of the Stakeholder Outreach efforts. It provides easy access to a variety of information for all stakeholders. The site includes salient details about the 800 MHz reconfiguration program, links to FCC and other related sites, press releases, Webinar registration, event schedules and reconfiguration guidance. During this quarter, the site received an estimated 23,000 total hits.

C. Outreach Events and TA-Sponsored Education and Training

Meetings & Conferences

Meetings and conferences attended by TA representatives in this quarter are provided in Appendix 8. In the upcoming quarter, the TA will attend the APCO Mid-Winter Conference in January 2006.

Webinars

The TA has delivered several Webinars on the various facets of reconfiguration for affected licensees. All modules in the series are tailored for delivery by system size – large or small – to allow for dialogue and questions to relate to the specific circumstances of each. The Webinar series to date has totaled 17 sessions with 446 attendees across the following stakeholder groups: 68 percent Public Safety; 4.6 percent CII; 2.5 percent B/ILT; and 24.7 percent Other (consultants, vendors, etc.), with the remainder unidentified (these percentages do

not include the RFPF Webinars as those sessions were not polled). In this quarter the TA offered six modules:

- Module 1: Planning and Negotiations
- Module 2: Frequency Proposals
- Module 3A: Cost Classifications & Reimbursements
- Request for Planning Funding
- Alternative Dispute Resolution Plan

Webinars have proven to be an effective, low-cost method for reaching wide audiences and providing interactive and just-in-time guidance. The TA solicited feedback following each delivery. According to these participant surveys, the reaction to the Webinars has been overwhelmingly positive, with participants indicating that the opportunity for live discussion is the most helpful aspect. Some commonly asked categories of questions include:

- Planning and Negotiations: For example, “What are the conditions upon which automatic assignment & mandatory negotiations will occur for the Wave 1?” “Once we start negotiations with [Sprint Nextel], will we have a negotiation deal manager that will be with us through the complete negotiation period?”
- Requests for Planning Funding & Costs: For example, “What costs are to be included in the RFPF?” “When should the RFPF be filed if you are in Wave 1 Stage 2?” “If, during the reconfiguration, your costs change can you request additional funding?”
- Reconfiguration Status: For example, “Has any Public Safety Agency obtained their pre-planning funding or rebanding contract?” “Your third quarter report said there have been few signed FRAs. Has that changed?”

Licensee Outreach Campaigns

In an effort to further the progress of reconfiguration, and in response to specific requests from the Public Safety community, the TA increased its communication and outreach efforts in this quarter. Specifically, the TA executed an outbound communications campaign to all licensees in Wave 1, Stage 1 that had not yet entered into an FRA. A goal of this campaign was to identify and resolve any issues that could impede progress. As these issues were identified, the TA implemented strategies for their resolution in a timely manner. In instances where a solution could not be easily found, the licensee was referred to the ADR process. Finally, a second campaign was launched after Sprint Nextel submitted a new list of approximately 70 licensees that it believed were likely not to complete an FRA during mandatory negotiation by December 26, 2005.

IV. FINANCIAL

A. Reconfiguration Expenditures

Reconfiguration expenditure information for the quarter ended December 31, 2005 will be reported after Sprint Nextel files with the Securities and Exchange Commission its Annual Report (SEC Form 10-K) for the year ended December 31, 2005.

B. Letters of Credit

For the quarter ended December 31, 2005, Sprint Nextel had made all its required payments to licensees and vendors within 30 days of the relevant Payment Obligation Date. Accordingly, there has been no need to draw on the Letters of Credit through December 31, 2005.

The TA is coordinating with Sprint Nextel to develop a timeline by which Sprint Nextel will provide its forecast of reconfiguration expenditures, together with detailed support and underlying assumptions, for TA review. There is no indication at this time that the Letters of Credit balance is insufficient to cover the costs of reconfiguration or that the Letters of Credit should be increased. Since Sprint Nextel has not yet presented its expenditures forecast to the TA for review, nor requested a reduction in the Letters of Credit, the TA does not recommend a reduction in the Letters of Credit at this time. The TA will reassess the need to increase or reduce the Letters of Credit in its Quarterly Progress Report to be filed for the quarter ending March 31, 2006.

C. Payment Process

Sprint Nextel recently implemented a process for payment of 800 MHz reconfiguration expenditures to licensees and vendors. Because the payment process used by Sprint Nextel relies on processes and controls that are under continued development and refinement, the TA has implemented additional procedures, in cooperation with Sprint Nextel, to support the TA's monitoring and review responsibilities outlined in the Payment Process previously provided to the FCC. These procedures encompass entering underlying data relevant to the Payment Process into a TA tracking system to run in parallel with Sprint Nextel's existing process to ensure timely payment by Sprint Nextel. Sprint Nextel informed the TA that it plans to enhance and automate its processes and controls supporting the Payment Process. Once these processes are implemented and reviewed to the satisfaction of the TA, the TA plans to rely on these processes and controls so that parallel processing by the TA will no longer be necessary. The expected timeframe for such implementation is during the first or second quarter of 2006.

D. 800 MHz Incumbent Reviews

As of December 31, 2005, Sprint Nextel had forwarded to the TA reconfiguration certifications signifying the completion of five (5) FRAs. The TA has reviewed the amounts expended on reconfigurations covered by these FRAs and concurs with the identified remaining payments due incumbents or refunds due Sprint Nextel, pending any results of the TA's post-close review rights or external audits.

E. External Auditor Selection

The TA has made a preliminary selection of the external audit firm for the 800 MHz reconfiguration program and will seek the FCC's concurrence with this selection in the first quarter of 2006.

F. Transition Administrator

1. Fees, Expenses and Staffing

The TA's fees and expenses for the quarter ended December 31, 2005 were \$7,351,813 in fees and \$294,174 in expenses, for a total of \$7,645,986, which is approximately \$600,000 lower than the forecast that was previously submitted to the FCC. Inception-to-date fees and expenses are \$28,074,389 in fees and \$1,533,423 in expenses, for a total of \$29,607,812. TA staffing as of December 31, 2005 consisted of 68.58 full-time equivalents ("FTEs"). The TA's fees and expenses for the quarter ending March 31, 2006 are estimated at \$8,800,000 in fees and \$290,000 in expenses, for a total of \$9,090,000. Additional details are provided in the attached Appendix 9.

2. Disclosure of Non-Reconfiguration Fees

In accordance with the TA's Independence Management Plan,²⁶ the TA reports that BearingPoint received \$167,992 from Sprint Nextel in non-TA fees and costs for the quarter ended December 31, 2005.

²⁶ See Independence Management Plan for the 800 MHz Transition Administrator Team Members (Version 1.1), WT Docket No. 02-55, 4 (filed May 9, 2005).

Appendix 1

Status of Frequency Reconfiguration Agreement Negotiations for Licensees in Channels 1-120: Milestones Completed by Number of Frequency Reconfiguration Agreements, Per Wave, Per Region, as of December 31, 2005

Public Safety Region	Number of Channels 1-120 FRAs (a)	Sprint Nextel Initiated Contact with Licensee (a)	Sprint Nextel and Licensee Reach Verbal Agreement(a)	FRAs Submitted to TA	FRAs Approved by TA
Wave 1	363	358	272	206	183
Multiregion	48	47	31	23	19
PSR Undetermined (b)	4	0	0	0	0
6	43	43	41	32	27
7	16	16	12	11	9
8	37	37	26	22	17
11	11	11	8	5	6
12	1	1	1	1	1
13	19	19	16	11	11
14	13	13	11	10	8
19	27	27	20	11	10
20	23	23	11	5	5
27	26	26	24	20	18
28	25	25	22	13	11
35	19	19	13	11	10
41	7	7	7	6	6
42	17	17	8	7	7
45	8	8	8	8	8
54	19	19	13	10	10
Wave 2	232	221	120	84	81
Multiregion	28	27	8	4	4
PSR Undetermined (b)	0	0	0	0	0
4	13	12	8	8	7
12	7	7	5	5	5
15	6	6	3	3	3
16	12	11	7	6	5
17	12	12	10	6	6
22	39	39	23	12	11
24	15	14	7	6	6
25	3	3	3	2	2
26	5	5	4	3	3
32	2	2	1	0	0
33	1	1	1	0	0
34	3	3	2	0	0
37	1	1	0	0	0
38	1	1	1	0	0
39	29	24	14	13	13
40	15	15	4	2	2
44	3	2	1	0	0
46	0	0	0	0	0
47	8	7	2	1	1
48	3	3	0	0	0
49	4	4	3	2	2
51	12	12	5	5	5
52	10	10	8	6	6
Wave 3	296	132	32	16	16
Multiregion	15	9	1	1	1
PSR Undetermined (b)	0	0	0	0	0
1	30	10	1	1	1
9	95	39	16	8	8
10	63	10	2	1	1
18	35	20	2	1	1
23	27	17	4	2	2
31	22	21	5	2	2
37	9	6	1	0	0

Appendix 1

**Status of Frequency Reconfiguration Agreement Negotiations for Licensees in Channels 1-120: Milestones Completed by
Number of Frequency Reconfiguration Agreements, Per Wave, Per Region, as of December 31, 2005**

Public Safety Region	Number of Channels 1- 120 FRAs (a)	Sprint Nextel Initiated Contact with Licensee (a)	Sprint Nextel and Licensee Reach Verbal Agreement(a)	FRAs Submitted to TA	FRAs Approved by TA
		Number of Frequency Reconfiguration Agreements (FRAs)			
Wave 4	158	51	24	9	9
Multiregion	11	5	3	0	0
PSR Undetermined (b)	2	2	0	0	0
2	11	4	4	2	2
3	36	10	6	1	1
5	27	1	0	0	0
21	3	0	0	0	0
29	10	8	3	1	1
30	8	4	3	1	1
33	17	0	0	0	0
36	4	4	0	0	0
43	8	1	1	1	1
50	9	5	4	3	3
53	6	6	0	0	0
54	6	1	0	0	0
55	0	0	0	0	0
Wave Undertermined (d)	1	0	1	0	0
TOTAL	1050	762	449	315	289

Notes:

a. Sprint Nextel is the data source for this column. The figures have not been verified by the TA.

b. PSR or Wave Undetermined - TA is unable to accurately assign a PSR and Wave based on data provided.

Appendix 2
Status of Reconfiguration for Licensees in Channels 1-120:
Milestones Completed by Number of Call Signs, Per Wave, Per Region, as of December 31, 2005

Public Safety Region	PSR Name	Updated Call Sign Population as of 12/31/05	Nextel Initiated Contact with Licensee	Nextel and Licensee Reach Pre-Contract Agreement	Nextel Submits Frequency Reconfiguration Agreement to TA	TA Approves Frequency Reconfiguration Agreement	Call Signs with Reconfiguration Applications Submitted to FCC
Wave 1	Subtotal	852	815	523	395	257	217
6	CA - North	112	112	69	47	36	24
7	Colorado	29	27	12	10	9	9
8	NY - Metro (CT, NJ, NY, PA)	97	98	66	57	26	22
11	Hawaii	56	59	45	41	10	9
13	Illinois	40	40	21	16	14	11
14	Indiana	27	29	26	16	14	7
19	ME, NH, VT, MA, RI, CT*	82	59	29	17	16	11
20	MD; DC; VA - Northern	67	67	44	36	18	16
27	Nevada	98	86	59	41	36	42
28	NJ, PA, DE	67	67	52	40	20	18
35	Oregon	55	52	23	14	14	13
41	Utah	21	21	21	12	7	7
42	Virginia	52	47	15	14	12	9
45	Wisconsin	13	14	14	13	12	11
54	Chicago	36	37	27	21	13	8
Wave 2	Subtotal	592	508	244	186	151	137
4	Arkansas	39	38	7	7	6	4
12	Idaho*	15	14	8	8	8	8
15	Iowa	17	16	9	9	9	9
16	Kansas	33	32	24	22	22	21
17	Kentucky	16	14	12	6	6	4
22	Minnesota*	76	75	57	33	19	17
24	Missouri	38	36	9	8	8	7
25	Montana*	20	16	12	11	11	6
26	Nebraska	11	12	6	5	5	5
32	North Dakota*	13	3	1	0	0	0
34	Oklahoma	26	26	10	8	8	8
38	South Dakota	11	5	1	0	0	0
39	Tennessee	46	42	28	21	21	21
40	TX - Dallas	39	39	14	12	3	3
44	West Virginia	4	3	2	1	1	1
46	Wyoming	1	1	1	1	1	0
47	Puerto Rico	66	22	4	1	1	1

Appendix 2
Status of Reconfiguration for Licensees in Channels 1-120:
Milestones Completed by Number of Call Signs, Per Wave, Per Region, as of December 31, 2005

Public Safety Region	PSR Name	Call Signs with Reconfiguration Applications Granted	Nextel Clears Frequencies	Incumbent Clears Frequencies	Call Signs with Surrender Applications Submitted to FCC	Call Signs with Surrender Applications Granted	Reconfiguration Certification Verified by TA
Wave 1	Subtotal	197	163	86	57	51	0
6	CA - North	24	26	6	3	2	0
7	Colorado	9	9	3	3	2	0
8	NY - Metro (CT, NJ, NY, PA)	18	20	8	9	8	0
11	Hawaii	9	9	8	0	0	0
13	Illinois	10	11	2	0	0	0
14	Indiana	6	9	3	0	0	0
19	ME, NH, VT, MA, RI, CT*	10	4	3	3	3	0
20	MD; DC; VA - Northern	12	0	0	0	0	0
27	Nevada	39	30	27	25	24	0
28	NJ, PA, DE	15	7	4	3	3	0
35	Oregon	13	13	5	4	3	0
41	Utah	7	7	5	4	4	0
42	Virginia	9	5	2	0	0	0
45	Wisconsin	9	10	8	1	1	0
54	Chicago	7	3	2	2	1	0
Wave 2	Subtotal	131	122	46	27	26	0
4	Arkansas	4	2	1	0	0	0
12	Idaho*	8	7	2	1	0	0
15	Iowa	6	6	5	0	0	0
16	Kansas	21	21	3	3	3	0
17	Kentucky	4	4	1	0	0	0
22	Minnesota*	16	15	4	3	3	0
24	Missouri	7	7	4	4	4	0
25	Montana*	6	10	2	3	3	0
26	Nebraska	5	5	3	4	4	0
32	North Dakota*	0	0	0	0	0	0
34	Oklahoma	8	8	0	0	0	0
38	South Dakota	0	0	0	0	0	0
39	Tennessee	20	16	13	2	2	0
40	TX - Dallas	3	3	1	2	2	0
44	West Virginia	1	0	0	0	0	0
46	Wyoming	0	0	0	0	0	0
47	Puerto Rico	1	0	0	0	0	0

Appendix 2
Status of Reconfiguration for Licensees in Channels 1-120:
Milestones Completed by Number of Call Signs, Per Wave, Per Region, as of December 31, 2005

Public Safety Region	PSR Name	Updated Call Sign Population as of 12/31/05	Nextel Initiated Contact with Licensee	Nextel and Licensee Reach Pre-Contract Agreement	Nextel Submits Frequency Reconfiguration Agreement to TA	TA Approves Frequency Reconfiguration Agreement	Call Signs with Reconfiguration Applications Submitted to FCC
		Number of Call Signs					
48	USVI	23	13	0	0	0	0
49	TX - Austin	12	12	7	6	6	6
51	TX - Houston	44	45	18	17	6	6
52	TX - Lubbock	42	44	14	10	10	10
Wave 3	Subtotal	504	313	52	30	16	22
1	Alabama	10	7	2	2	2	3
9	Florida	220	112	31	19	8	9
10	Georgia	53	13	1	0	0	2
18	Louisiana	90	57	4	2	2	1
23	Mississippi	25	22	6	3	1	5
31	North Carolina	69	66	7	4	3	2
37	South Carolina	37	36	1	0	0	0
Wave 4	Subtotal	828	130	56	22	21	17
2	Alaska*	36	10	10	2	2	1
3	Arizona*	78	44	16	7	6	6
5	CA - South*	140	7	3	3	3	1
21	Michigan*	60	0	0	0	0	0
29	New Mexico*	25	19	6	2	2	1
30	NY - Albany*	96	8	4	1	1	1
33	Ohio*	102	2	2	0	0	0
36	Pennsylvania*	12	7	2	0	0	0
43	Washington*	160	9	8	3	3	3
50	TX - El Paso*	11	7	4	3	3	3
53	TX - San Antonio*	17	16	1	1	1	1
54	MI portion of Chicago*	9	1	0	0	0	0
55	New York - Buffalo*	82	0	0	0	0	0
61	Gulf of Mexico	0	0	0	0	0	0
62	Marianas	0	0	0	0	0	0
63	Guam	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total for Waves 1-4		2776	1766	875	633	445	393

Appendix 2
Status of Reconfiguration for Licensees in Channels 1-120:
Milestones Completed by Number of Call Signs, Per Wave, Per Region, as of December 31, 2005

Public Safety Region	PSR Name	Call Signs with Reconfiguration Applications Granted	Nextel Clears Frequencies	Incumbent Clears Frequencies	Call Signs with Surrender Applications Submitted to FCC	Call Signs with Surrender Applications Granted	Reconfiguration Certification Verified by TA
		Number of Call Signs					
48	USVI	0	0	0	0	0	0
49	TX - Austin	6	6	1	1	1	0
51	TX - Houston	5	5	3	2	2	0
52	TX - Lubbock	10	7	3	2	2	0
Wave 3	Subtotal	17	10	6	4	2	0
1	Alabama	3	1	1	0	0	0
9	Florida	8	6	4	3	1	0
10	Georgia	0	0	0	0	0	0
18	Louisiana	1	2	0	0	0	0
23	Mississippi	4	0	0	0	0	0
31	North Carolina	1	1	1	1	1	0
37	South Carolina	0	0	0	0	0	0
Wave 4	Subtotal	14	12	4	3	3	0
2	Alaska*	1	0	0	0	0	0
3	Arizona*	4	4	1	1	1	0
5	CA - South*	1	1	0	0	0	0
21	Michigan*	0	0	0	0	0	0
29	New Mexico*	1	1	0	0	0	0
30	NY - Albany*	1	1	1	0	0	0
33	Ohio*	0	0	0	0	0	0
36	Pennsylvania*	0	0	0	0	0	0
43	Washington*	3	3	1	1	1	0
50	TX - El Paso*	2	1	0	0	0	0
53	TX - San Antonio*	1	1	1	1	1	0
54	MI portion of Chicago*	0	0	0	0	0	0
55	New York - Buffalo*	0	0	0	0	0	0
61	Gulf of Mexico	0	0	0	0	0	0
62	Marianas	0	0	0	0	0	0
63	Guam	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total for Waves 1-4		359	307	142	91	82	0

Appendix 2
Status of Reconfiguration for Licensees in Channels 1-120:
Milestones Completed by Number of Call Signs, Per Wave, Per Region, as of December 31, 2005

Public Safety Region	PSR Name	Updated Call Sign Population as of 12/31/05	Nextel Initiated Contact with Licensee	Nextel and Licensee Reach Pre-Contract Agreement	Nextel Submits Frequency Reconfiguration Agreement to TA	TA Approves Frequency Reconfiguration Agreement	Call Signs with Reconfiguration Applications Submitted to FCC
		Number of Call Signs					

Notes:

- a. Data for Channel 1-120 call signs does not include call signs in Wave 1 and Wave 2 that were under contract with Nextel prior to the start of reconfiguration and for which contracts are not going to be submitted to the TA for review and approval for Nextel credit.
- b. Data includes call signs in the international border area. Data may change depending on treaty negotiation outcomes.
- c. The current population of call signs has been adjusted for call signs cancelled without a Frequency Reconfiguration Agreement (FRA), and incremented for any call signs added through pending applications. Licensees may independently cancel licenses or let them expire without entering into an FRA. TA, Nextel and industry outreach efforts may also contribute to encouraging licensees not longer using licenses to unilaterally cancel them.
- d. Data includes call signs with fixed locations authorized for frequencies the 851-854 MHz range with adequate geographic data to determine a Public Safety Region.
- e. Data for the call sign population and applications may not match data for Nextel milestones due to call signs expiring or being cancelled without contracts. Also, certain FRAs may include call signs undergoing reconfiguration that may be cancelled or assigned without frequencies being changed on that particular call sign.

Appendix 3			
Entities Filing Expansion Band Elections as of January 24, 2006			

LICENSEE	ST	CALL SIGN	FREQUENCIES
Mobile, County of	AL	WNUX634	857.7625, 857.9875, 858.2375, 858.2625, 858.4375, 858.4625
Bentonville, City of	AR	WPPH830	860.2625
Fayetteville, City of	AR	WPJI661	860.2375, 860.7375
Hot Springs, City of	AR	WPHP482	860.2625
Jefferson, County of	AR	WPLY444	860.2125
Jefferson, County of	AR	WNV873	860.2375, 860.2625, 860.7375, 860.9625
Paragould, City of	AR	WPFN317	860.2875
Marin, County of	CA	WPFQ266	860.4625
Marin, County of	CA	KNJH407	860.9375
Placer, County of	CA	WPIE742	860.9375
Sacramento, County of	CA	WNBQ990	860.7125
Sacramento, County of	CA	WPDD467	860.2125, 860.4375
Sacramento, County of	CA	WPWV729	860.4875
Sacramento, County of	CA	WPXL514	860.4875
Sacramento, County of	CA	WQDK496	860.4875
Sacramento, County of	CA	WQDK705	860.4875
San Francisco, City and County of	CA	KNGD851	860.4875
San Francisco, City and County of	CA	WPQA782	860.4875
San Francisco, City and County of	CA	WNMP522	860.4625
San Francisco, City and County of	CA	WNMP411	n/a*
San Francisco, City and County of	CA	WNNF327	860.4375
San Francisco, City and County of	CA	WPQF830	860.2125
Stanislaus, County of (Mountain Valley Emergency Medical Services Agency)	CA	WNVJ731	860.9375
Watsonville, City of	CA	WPKI847	860.2375
Arapahoe, County of	CO	WNIJ887	860.3125
Aurora, City of	CO	WNAU532	860.7625, 860.9375, 860.9625, 860.9875
Cromwell, Town of	CT	WNKR770	860.9625
District of Columbia	DC	WPXT459	860.9875
District of Columbia	DC	KNJU834	860.9875
Honolulu, City and County of	HI	WPRG484	860.4625
Honolulu, City and County of	HI	WPQZ565	860.4625
Iowa City, City of	IA	WNXG714	860.2625
Iowa City, City of	IA	WNXG746	860.9875
University of Iowa Hospital & Clinics	IA	WPKN529	860.2125
Idaho, State of	ID	WPIP622	860.7625
Idaho, State of	ID	WPIP626	860.7625
Idaho, State of	ID	WPI652	860.7625
Deerfield, Village of (Police Department)	IL	WNGC398	860.7375
Gurnee, Village of	IL	WNAR378	860.2625
Gurnee, Village of	IL	WNBG488	n/a*
Illinois, State of (Dept of Corrections)	IL	WPLR422	860.2625
Illinois, State of (Dept of Corrections)	IL	WPMR362	860.7375
Illinois, State of (Dept of Corrections)	IL	WPPD278	860.9375
Peoria County Sheriffs Department	IL	WQAB235	860.2625, 860.9625, 860.9875
Tazewell, County of	IL	WPNW387	860.7125
Tazewell, County of	IL	WQCX272	n/a*
Westmont, Village of	IL	WNNO865	860.2625
Westmont, Village of	IL	WQBR321	860.2625
Williamson, County of	IL	WPKM918	860.7625
Steuben, County of	IN	WPDU229	860.2125
Allegany, County of	MD	WPRS598	860.4875
Garrett, County of (Board of Education)	MD	WPRU936	860.7375
Salisbury, City of	MD	WPHQ675	860.7625
Minnesota, State of	MN	WPER943	860.2375, 860.2625, 860.4375, 860.9375, 860.9875
Minnesota, State of	MN	WPKG359	860.9375
Minnesota, State of	MN	WPKG360	860.2625
Minnesota, State of	MN	WPYM573	860.9875
Curators of the University of Missouri	MO	WPJI572	860.2125
Scotts Bluff, County of	NE	WPKU672	860.2125, 860.2375, 860.2625, 860.4875, 860.7375
Manchester, City of	NH	WPDK444	860.4875
New Jersey, State of	NJ	WPYQ725	860.4625, 860.9625
New Jersey, State of	NJ	WNDD574	860.4625, 860.9625
New Jersey, State of	NJ	WNZZ317	860.7125
New Jersey, State of	NJ	WNXC891	860.2125, 860.7125
New Jersey, State of	NJ	WNPS351	860.4625, 860.9625
New Jersey, State of	NJ	WNII538	860.9375
New Jersey, State of	NJ	WNHS410	860.2125, 860.4625, 860.7125, 860.9625

Appendix 3			
Entities Filing Expansion Band Elections as of January 24, 2006			

LICENSEE	ST	CALL SIGN	FREQUENCIES
New Jersey, State of	NJ	WNHS409	860.9375
New Jersey, State of	NJ	WNDD580	860.2125, 860.7125
New Jersey, State of	NJ	WNDD579	860.9375
New Jersey, State of	NJ	WNDD578	860.9375
New Jersey, State of	NJ	WNDD577	860.9375
New Jersey, State of	NJ	WNDD576	860.2125, 860.7125
New Jersey, State of	NJ	WNDD575	860.2125, 860.7125
New Jersey, State of	NJ	WNDD573	860.4625, 860.9625
New Jersey, State of	NJ	WNDD572	860.4625, 860.9625
New Jersey, State of	NJ	WNDD571	860.4625, 860.9625
New Jersey, State of	NJ	WNDD570	860.4625, 860.9625
New Jersey, State of	NJ	WQBY316	860.4625, 860.9625
New Jersey, State of	NJ	WPUH543	860.9375
New Jersey, State of	NJ	WNXZ718	860.9625
New Jersey, State of	NJ	WNXC890	860.4625, 860.9625
New Jersey, State of	NJ	WNJI598	860.9375
New Jersey, State of	NJ	WPSE858	860.2125, 860.7125
Vineland, City of	NJ	WNXZ709	860.4625, 860.9625
Washoe, County of	NV	WPRX312	860.2125, 860.2375, 860.2625, 860.4375, 860.4625, 860.4875, 860.7625, 860.9375, 860.9875
Washoe, County of	NV	WPRX313	860.7625
City of New York DoITT FCC Licensing Support	NY	KNBX914	860.7375, 860.9875
City of New York DoITT FCC Licensing Support	NY	KNER623	860.4375, 860.7625, 860.9375
City of New York DoITT FCC Licensing Support	NY	WPML526	860.7625
City of New York DoITT FCC Licensing Support	NY	WPML463	860.7625
City of New York DoITT FCC Licensing Support	NY	WPML524	860.7625
City of New York DoITT FCC Licensing Support	NY	WPML525	860.7625
City of New York DoITT FCC Licensing Support	NY	WQCI937	860.4375
New York City Transit Authority	NY	KNEH690	860.3875, 860.4125
New York City Transit Authority	NY	WNUB732	860.3875, 860.4125
New York City Transit Authority	NY	WNUB684	860.3875, 860.4125
New York City Transit Authority	NY	KB23096	n/a*
New York City Transit Authority	NY	KNEH691	n/a*
Salem, City of	OR	WPKB609	860.4875
Allentown, City of	PA	WPJK416	860.9375
Rhode Island, State of	RI	WNCX326	860.3125
South Carolina State Ports Authority	SC	WPLU704	860.7125
Clarksville, City of	TN	WQCL650	860.2375
Memphis, City of	TN	WPAB818	860.3375, 860.3875
Anderson County, Texas	TX	WPYA801	860.2375, 860.9875
Dallas, City of	TX	WNBG573	860.7375, 860.9875
Harris, County of	TX	WNBZ674	860.2125, 860.2375, 860.4625, 860.4875, 860.7125
Harris, County of	TX	WPPF214	860.2125, 860.2375, 860.4625, 860.4875, 860.7125
Harris, County of	TX	WQBM285	860.7125
Houston, City of	TX	KNIV874	860.2625, 860.4375, 860.7625, 860.9375
Houston, City of (Dept. of Aviation)	TX	WPNW558	860.7375
Houston, City of (Dept. of Aviation)	TX	KNDH570	860.2875, 860.3125
Missouri City	TX	WNAS493	860.9625
Texas Tech University	TX	KNNJ876	860.9625
Travis, County of	TX	WPZR511	860.4375
Travis, County of	TX	WPYE612	860.2125, 860.2625
Salt Lake Department of Airports	UT	WNYR765	860.2375, 860.2625, 860.4875
Salt Lake Department of Airports	UT	WQBM266	860.2625
Salt Lake Department of Airports	UT	WQBI350	860.2625
Virginia Beach, City of	VA	WNAU439	860.4625, 860.4875, 860.7125, 860.7375
Virginia Beach, City of	VA	WNSS359	860.4875, 860.7375
Virginia, Commonwealth of (Dept of Corrections)	VA	WPIZ624	860.4875
Virginia, Commonwealth of (NVCC)	VA	WPRR746	860.4875
Ozaukee, County of	WI	WNWS961	860.7125, 860.7625

* Licensee listed a Call Sign that does not have any frequencies within the Expansion Band (860-861 MHz) on their Expansion Band Election Form.

Appendix 4
Call Sign-Related Reconfiguration Information, as of December 31, 2005

Current Population of Call Signs, Per Wave, Per Region, as of December 31, 2005

Public Safety Region	PSR Name	Channels 1-120	Public Safety Expansion Band	NPSPAC Channel	SE-ESMR ESMR Band	Total
Number of Call Signs						
Wave 1	Subtotal	852	416	1467	0	2735
6	CA - North	112	103	108	0	323
7	Colorado	29	14	139	0	182
8	NY - Metro (CT, NJ, NY, PA)	97	27	322	0	446
11	Hawaii	56	5	20	0	81
13	Illinois	40	22	110	0	172
14	Indiana	27	44	103	0	174
19	ME, NH, VT, MA, RI, CT*	82	24	91	0	197
20	MD; DC; VA - Northern	67	23	75	0	165
27	Nevada	98	25	30	0	153
28	NJ, PA, DE	67	38	230	0	335
35	Oregon	55	13	31	0	99
41	Utah	21	10	61	0	92
42	Virginia	52	23	37	0	112
45	Wisconsin	13	13	2	0	28
54	Chicago	36	32	108	0	176
Wave 2	Subtotal	592	259	539	12	1402
4	Arkansas	39	52	71	0	162
12	Idaho*	15	3	0	0	18
15	Iowa	17	17	5	0	39
16	Kansas	33	10	169	0	212
17	Kentucky	16	25	11	0	52
22	Minnesota*	76	19	31	0	126
24	Missouri	38	14	16	0	68
25	Montana*	20	0	0	0	20
26	Nebraska	11	10	20	0	41
32	North Dakota*	13	1	1	0	15
34	Oklahoma	26	11	19	0	56
38	South Dakota	11	1	0	0	12
39	Tennessee	46	42	51	12	151
40	TX - Dallas	39	21	40	0	100
44	West Virginia	4	3	8	0	15
46	Wyoming	1	2	4	0	7
47	Puerto Rico	66	6	10	0	82
48	USVI	23	0	0	0	23
49	TX - Austin	12	12	47	0	71
51	TX - Houston	44	8	34	0	86
52	TX - Lubbock	42	2	2	0	46
Wave 3	Subtotal	504	310	743	259	1816
1	Alabama	10	33	23	61	127
9	Florida	220	87	289	38	634
10	Georgia	53	31	54	84	222
18	Louisiana	90	58	51	5	204
23	Mississippi	25	25	16	51	117
31	North Carolina	69	42	167	7	285
37	South Carolina	37	34	143	13	227
Wave 4	Subtotal	828	377	1236	0	2441
2	Alaska*	36	8	1	0	45
3	Arizona*	78	28	56	0	162
5	CA - South*	140	134	294	0	568
21	Michigan*	60	2	255	0	317
29	New Mexico*	25	4	9	0	38
30	NY - Albany*	96	69	178	0	343
33	Ohio*	102	39	119	0	260
36	Pennsylvania*	12	19	139	0	170
43	Washington*	160	24	138	0	322
50	TX - El Paso*	11	5	2	0	18
53	TX - San Antonio*	17	18	23	0	58
54	MI portion of Chicago*	9	8	18	0	35
55	New York - Buffalo*	82	16	4	0	102
61	Gulf of Mexico	0	0	0	0	0
62	Marianas	0	2	0	0	2
63	Guam	0	1	0	0	1
Total for Waves 1-4		2776	1362	3985	271	8394

Appendix 4
Call Sign-Related Reconfiguration Information, as of December 31, 2005

Public Safety Expansion Band Elections Totals, as of December 31, 2005
(Elections NOT to Reconfigure)

PSR	PSR Name	Call Signs
1	Alabama	1
4	Arkansas	3
6	CA - North	14
7	Colorado	2
8	NY - Metro (CT, NJ, NY, PA)	24
11	Hawaii	2
12	Idaho*	3
13	Illinois	6
14	Indiana	1
15	Iowa	3
19	ME, NH, VT, MA, RI, CT*	2
20	MD; DC; VA - Northern	6
22	Minnesota*	3
24	Missouri	1
26	Nebraska	1
27	Nevada	1
28	NJ, PA, DE	13
35	Oregon	1
37	South Carolina	1
39	Tennessee	2
40	TX - Dallas	2
41	Utah	2
42	Virginia	3
45	Wisconsin	1
49	TX - Austin	2
51	TX - Houston	7
52	TX - Lubbock	1
54	Chicago	5
Grand Total		113

Appendix 4
Call Sign-Related Reconfiguration Information, as of December 31, 2005

Frequency Proposal Reports for Wave 1, 2 and 3 as of December 31, 2005

Status	Wave 1		Wave 2			Wave 3		
	1-120	Exp Band	1-120	SE-ESMR	Exp Band	1-120	SE-ESMR	Exp Band
FPR Sent	83.6%	98.5%	79.6%	71.4%	90.9%	77.4%	60.3%	53.1%
Under Prior Contract	7.7%	0.4%	5.7%	0.0%	0.0%	3.7%	17.2%	0.0%
In Border Zone	2.6%	0.6%	3.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
EA/ESMR Related Call Signs	5.8%	0.0%	9.4%	0.0%	2.2%	8.4%	0.0%	0.0%
Recent grants, revised proposals	0.0%	0.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.4%
FPRs (in process 12/31/2005)	0.3%	0.2%	1.6%	28.6%	6.9%	10.5%	22.4%	46.5%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Notes:

* PSR includes international border area, data may change depending on outcome of treaty negotiation.

a. Data for Channel 1-120 call signs excludes call signs that were under contract with Sprint Nextel prior to the start of reconfiguration and for which contracts are not going to be submitted to the TA for review and approval for Sprint Nextel credit. Data for Expansion Band call signs excludes call signs under prior contract and call signs for which licensees have elected not to reconfigure.

b. Data includes call signs in the international border area. Data may change depending on treaty negotiation outcomes.

c. The current population of call signs has been adjusted for call signs cancelled without a Frequency Reconfiguration Agreement (FRA), and incremented for any call signs added through pending applications. Licensees may independently cancel licenses or let them expire without entering into an FRA. TA, Sprint Nextel and industry outreach efforts may also contribute to encouraging licensees no longer using licenses to unilaterally cancel them.

d. 1-120 Data includes call signs with at least one primary fixed location authorized for frequencies the 851 - 854 MHz range with adequate geographic data to determine a Public Safety Region. Expansion Band data includes call signs with at least one primary fixed locations in the Expansion Band, as the Expansion Band may be defined in inside and outside the Southeast ESMR region, with adequate geographic data to determine a Public Safety Region. NPSPAC data includes call signs with fixed locations in the 866 - 869 MHz range with adequate geographic data to determine a Public Safety Region. SE_ESMR ESMR Band data includes call signs with fixed locations in 858.5 - 862 MHz range within the Southeast ESMR region and with adequate geographic data to determine a Public Safety Region. Call signs with locations in multiple PSRs are counted for each PSR. Data may also include call signs authorized under a Special Temporary Authority if the STA is to operate pending the grant of a regular authorization.

e. Data has been adjusted to reflect the change in the band-plan in the Atlanta area per the Memorandum Opinion and Order released October 5, 2005.

Appendix 5							
Status of Reconfiguration Contract Review, Per Wave, Per Region, as of December 31, 2005							

Public Safety Region	PSR Name	1-5 Days from Receipt	6-10 Days from Receipt	11-15 Days from Receipt	16-20 Days from Receipt	21 Days or More from Receipt	Total
Number of Frequency Reconfiguration Agreements (FRAs)							
Wave 1	Subtotal	173	8	1	1	0	183
	Multiregion	20	2	0	0	0	22
6	Northern California	27	0	0	0	0	27
7	Colorado	9	0	0	0	0	9
8	Metropolitan, NYC Area (NY, NJ, CT)	17	1	0	0	0	18
11	Hawaii	4	0	0	0	0	4
12	Idaho	1	0	0	0	0	1
13	Illinois	10	0	0	0	0	10
14	Indiana	8	1	0	0	0	9
19	New England	10	0	0	0	0	10
20	MD; DC; VA - Northern	4	0	0	1	0	5
27	Nevada	16	2	0	0	0	18
28	Eastern Pennsylvania	10	0	1	0	0	11
35	Oregon	9	0	0	0	0	9
41	Utah	5	0	0	0	0	5
42	Virginia	7	0	0	0	0	7
45	Wisconsin	8	0	0	0	0	8
54	Southern Lake Michigan	8	2	0	0	0	10
Wave 2	Subtotal	75	4	2	0	0	81
	Multiregion	4	1	1	0	0	6
4	Arkansas	6	1	0	0	0	7
12	Idaho*	4	1	0	0	0	5
15	Iowa	3	0	0	0	0	3
16	Kansas	5	0	0	0	0	5
17	Kentucky	6	0	0	0	0	6
22	Minnesota	9	0	1	0	0	10
24	Missouri	5	0	0	0	0	5
25	Montana	2	0	0	0	0	2
26	Nebraska	3	0	0	0	0	3
32	North Dakota*	0	0	0	0	0	0
34	Oklahoma	0	0	0	0	0	0
38	South Dakota	0	0	0	0	0	0
39	Tennessee	13	0	0	0	0	13
40	Texas (Central & Northeast)	2	0	0	0	0	2
44	West Virginia	0	0	0	0	0	0
46	Wyoming	0	0	0	0	0	0
47	Puerto Rico	1	0	0	0	0	1
48	USVI	0	0	0	0	0	0
49	Texas - Central (Austin Area)	1	1	0	0	0	2
51	Texas - East (Houston Area)	5	0	0	0	0	5
52	Texas - Panhandle, High Plains & NW	6	0	0	0	0	6
Wave 3	Subtotal	14	2	0	0	0	16
	Multiregion	1	0	0	0	0	1
1	Alabama	1	0	0	0	0	1
9	Florida	7	1	0	0	0	8
10	Georgia	1	0	0	0	0	1
18	Louisiana	0	1	0	0	0	1
23	Mississippi	2	0	0	0	0	2
31	North Carolina	2	0	0	0	0	2
37	South Carolina	0	0	0	0	0	0

Appendix 5
Status of Reconfiguration Contract Review, Per Wave, Per Region, as of December 31, 2005

Public Safety Region	PSR Name	1-5 Days from Receipt	6-10 Days from Receipt	11-15 Days from Receipt	16-20 Days from Receipt	21 Days or More from Receipt	Total
Number of Frequency Reconfiguration Agreements (FRAs)							
Wave 4	Subtotal	9	0	0	0	0	9
	Multiregion	0	0	0	0	0	0
2	Alaska*	2	0	0	0	0	2
3	Arizona*	1	0	0	0	0	1
5	CA - South*	0	0	0	0	0	0
21	Michigan*	0	0	0	0	0	0
29	New Mexico*	1	0	0	0	0	1
30	Eastern Upstate NY*	1	0	0	0	0	1
33	Ohio*	0	0	0	0	0	0
36	Pennsylvania*	0	0	0	0	0	0
43	Washington*	1	0	0	0	0	1
50	TX - El Paso*	3	0	0	0	0	3
53	TX - San Antonio*	0	0	0	0	0	0
54	MI portion of Chicago*	0	0	0	0	0	0
55	New York - Buffalo*	0	0	0	0	0	0
Totals for Waves 1 - 4		271	14	3	1	0	289

Notes:

* PSR includes international border area. Data may change depending on treaty negotiation outcomes.

Appendix 6

**Status of Frequency Reconfiguration Agreement Negotiations for Licensees in Channels 1-120:
Milestones Completed by Number of Frequency Reconfiguration Agreements, Per Wave, Per Region,
as of January 28, 2006**

Public Safety Region	Number of Channels 1-120 FRAs (a)	Sprint Nextel Initiated Contact with Licensee (a)	Sprint Nextel and Licensee Reach Verbal Agreement(a)	FRAs Submitted to TA	FRAs Approved by TA
Wave 1	369	367	304	258	238
Multiregion	110	108	81	69	63
PSR Undetermined (b)	0	0	0	0	0
6	34	34	31	26	26
7	11	11	10	10	9
8	33	33	30	27	24
11	12	12	10	6	6
12	0	0	0	0	0
13	17	17	15	9	9
14	9	9	8	7	6
19	15	15	14	12	10
20	18	18	9	10	5
27	22	22	22	21	20
28	24	24	23	18	17
35	18	18	13	11	11
41	7	7	7	7	7
42	15	15	9	7	7
45	7	7	7	7	7
54	17	17	15	11	11
Wave 2	232	224	132	95	92
Multiregion	70	70	37	27	25
PSR Undetermined (b)	0	0	0	0	0
4	10	9	6	6	6
12	4	4	2	2	2
15	5	5	3	3	3
16	9	8	6	5	5
17	10	10	8	5	5
22	28	28	17	13	12
24	11	11	3	3	3
25	3	3	3	2	2
26	4	4	3	3	3
32	1	1	0	0	0
33	1	1	1	0	0
34	3	3	2	0	0
37	0	0	0	0	0
38	1	1	1	0	0
39	27	23	15	13	13
40	13	13	5	2	2
44	2	1	1	0	0
46	1	1	1	0	0
47	8	7	2	1	1
48	3	3	0	0	0
49	3	3	3	2	2
51	6	6	6	3	3
52	9	9	7	5	5
Wave 3	297	208	38	21	19
Multiregion	77	51	6	3	3
PSR Undetermined (b)	0	0	0	0	0
1	28	20	2	2	1
9	61	49	15	7	7
10	52	29	3	2	2
18	31	22	2	2	2
23	23	14	4	2	2
31	17	17	5	3	2
37	8	6	1	0	0

Appendix 6

**Status of Frequency Reconfiguration Agreement Negotiations for Licensees in Channels 1-120:
Milestones Completed by Number of Frequency Reconfiguration Agreements, Per Wave, Per Region,
as of January 28, 2006**

Public Safety Region	Number of Channels 1-120 FRAs (a)	Sprint Nextel Initiated Contact with Licensee (a)	Sprint Nextel and Licensee Reach Verbal Agreement(a)	FRAs Submitted to TA	FRAs Approved by TA
Wave 4	156	53	26	12	12
Multiregion	38	11	7	2	2
PSR Undetermined (b)	0	0	0	0	0
2	10	4	4	3	3
3	33	13	7	3	3
5	16	1	0	0	0
21	3	0	0	0	0
29	8	6	1	0	0
30	7	3	2	1	1
33	12	0	0	0	0
36	3	3	1	0	0
43	8	1	1	1	1
50	7	3	3	2	2
53	6	6	0	0	0
54	5	2	0	0	0
55	0	0	0	0	0
Wave Undetermined (Note C)	5	2	4	0	0
TOTAL	1059	854	504	386	361

Notes:

- a. Sprint Nextel is the data source for this column. The figures have not been verified by the TA.
b. PSR or Wave Undetermined - TA is unable to accurately assign a PSR and Wave based on data provided.

Note C: Wave Undetermined Details

Deal ID	Initial Contact	Deal Director Approval	FRA Received	FRA Approved
DL8904415040		02/05/05	0	0
DL8904426024			0	0
DL8910425464	11/22/05	01/09/06	0	0
DL8910426024	01/06/06	01/12/06	0	0
ST0000414490		09/29/04	0	0

Appendix 7
Status of Reconfiguration for Licensees in Channels 1-120:
Milestones Completed by Number of Call Signs, Per Wave, Per Region, as of January 28, 2006

Public Safety Region	PSR Name	Updated Call Sign Population as of 12/31/05	Nextel Initiated Contact with Licensee	Nextel and Licensee Reach Pre-Contract Agreement	Nextel Submits Frequency Reconfiguration Agreement to TA	TA Approves Frequency Reconfiguration Agreement	Through 01/28/06 Call Signs with Reconfiguration Applications Submitted to FCC
Wave 1	Subtotal	852	817	591	501	396	300
6	CA - North	112	112	65	55	46	43
7	Colorado	29	27	18	18	14	12
8	NY - Metro (CT, NJ, NY, PA)	97	98	79	70	38	35
11	Hawaii	56	59	54	42	42	10
13	Illinois	40	40	27	16	16	13
14	Indiana	27	29	27	24	22	16
19	ME, NH, VT, MA, RI, CT*	82	59	34	32	27	18
20	MD; DC; VA - Northern	67	67	48	42	22	19
27	Nevada	98	86	63	60	56	45
28	NJ, PA, DE	67	67	56	48	33	30
35	Oregon	55	54	30	19	19	15
41	Utah	21	21	21	21	16	7
42	Virginia	52	47	26	17	16	13
45	Wisconsin	13	14	14	13	13	12
54	Chicago	36	37	29	24	16	12
Wave 2	Subtotal	592	510	278	230	176	158
4	Arkansas	39	38	23	23	8	6
12	Idaho*	15	14	8	8	8	8
15	Iowa	17	16	10	10	9	9
16	Kansas	33	32	24	23	23	21
17	Kentucky	16	15	12	8	8	7
22	Minnesota*	76	75	59	47	33	26
24	Missouri	38	37	10	8	8	7
25	Montana*	20	16	12	11	11	6
26	Nebraska	11	12	6	5	5	5
32	North Dakota*	13	3	1	1	1	0
34	Oklahoma	26	26	11	8	8	8
38	South Dakota	11	5	1	0	0	0
39	Tennessee	46	42	30	26	26	26
40	TX - Dallas	39	39	21	12	3	3
44	West Virginia	4	3	2	1	1	1
46	Wyoming	1	1	1	1	1	1
47	Puerto Rico	66	22	4	1	1	1
48	USVI	23	13	0	0	0	0
49	TX - Austin	12	12	7	6	6	6

Appendix 7
Status of Reconfiguration for Licensees in Channels 1-120:
Milestones Completed by Number of Call Signs, Per Wave, Per Region, as of January 28, 2006

Public Safety Region	PSR Name	Through 01/28/06 Call Signs with Reconfiguration Applications Granted	Nextel Clears Frequencies	Incumbent Clears Frequencies	Through 01/28/06 Call Signs with Surrender Applications Submitted to FCC	Through 01/28/06 Call Signs with Surrender Applications Granted	Reconfiguration Certification Verified by TA
Wave 1	Subtotal	262	233	140	80	63	3
6	CA - North	38	39	15	7	5	0
7	Colorado	11	10	6	5	5	0
8	NY - Metro (CT, NJ, NY, PA)	28	27	8	8	8	0
11	Hawaii	9	10	9	0	0	0
13	Illinois	12	13	8	0	0	0
14	Indiana	11	11	6	1	1	0
19	ME, NH, VT, MA, RI, CT*	15	5	3	3	3	0
20	MD; DC; VA - Northern	18	1	0	0	0	0
27	Nevada	43	42	37	28	26	0
28	NJ, PA, DE	23	17	13	10	3	0
35	Oregon	15	18	10	6	4	3
41	Utah	7	16	7	6	4	0
42	Virginia	12	6	5	1	0	0
45	Wisconsin	11	11	9	2	1	0
54	Chicago	9	7	4	3	3	0
Wave 2	Subtotal	145	142	77	40	34	3
4	Arkansas	6	7	1	0	0	0
12	Idaho*	8	8	6	2	2	1
15	Iowa	8	9	5	0	0	0
16	Kansas	21	21	4	4	4	0
17	Kentucky	7	6	2	0	0	0
22	Minnesota*	20	15	11	9	8	1
24	Missouri	7	7	5	5	4	0
25	Montana*	6	10	5	3	3	0
26	Nebraska	5	5	5	4	4	0
32	North Dakota*	0	1	0	0	0	0
34	Oklahoma	8	8	0	0	0	0
38	South Dakota	0	0	0	0	0	0
39	Tennessee	21	20	16	4	2	1
40	TX - Dallas	3	3	2	2	2	0
44	West Virginia	1	0	0	0	0	0
46	Wyoming	0	0	0	0	0	0
47	Puerto Rico	1	0	0	0	0	0
48	USVI	0	0	0	0	0	0
49	TX - Austin	6	6	6	1	1	0

Appendix 7
Status of Reconfiguration for Licensees in Channels 1-120:
Milestones Completed by Number of Call Signs, Per Wave, Per Region, as of January 28, 2006

Public Safety Region	PSR Name	Updated Call Sign Population as of 12/31/05	Nextel Initiated Contact with Licensee	Nextel and Licensee Reach Pre-Contract Agreement	Nextel Submits Frequency Reconfiguration Agreement to TA	TA Approves Frequency Reconfiguration Agreement	Through 01/28/06 Call Signs with Reconfiguration Applications Submitted to FCC
		Number of Call Signs					
51	TX - Houston	44	45	22	21	6	6
52	TX - Lubbock	42	44	14	10	10	11
Wave 3	Subtotal	504	377	74	53	23	24
1	Alabama	10	9	2	2	2	3
9	Florida	220	156	34	20	9	10
10	Georgia	53	25	1	1	1	2
18	Louisiana	90	62	15	14	3	1
23	Mississippi	25	22	13	10	4	5
31	North Carolina	69	67	8	6	4	3
37	South Carolina	37	36	1	0	0	0
Wave 4	Subtotal	828	137	58	27	26	22
2	Alaska*	36	10	10	3	3	3
3	Arizona*	78	47	17	9	8	6
5	CA - South*	140	7	3	3	3	1
21	Michigan*	60	0	0	0	0	0
29	New Mexico*	25	19	6	2	2	2
30	NY - Albany*	96	8	4	1	1	1
33	Ohio*	102	5	2	1	1	2
36	Pennsylvania*	12	7	3	1	1	0
43	Washington*	160	9	8	3	3	3
50	TX - El Paso*	11	7	4	3	3	3
53	TX - San Antonio*	17	16	1	1	1	1
54	MI portion of Chicago*	9	2	0	0	0	0
55	New York - Buffalo*	82	0	0	0	0	0
61	Gulf of Mexico	0	0	0	0	0	0
62	Marianas	0	0	0	0	0	0
63	Guam	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total for Waves 1-4		2776	1841	1001	811	621	504

Appendix 7
Status of Reconfiguration for Licensees in Channels 1-120:
Milestones Completed by Number of Call Signs, Per Wave, Per Region, as of January 28, 2006

Public Safety Region	PSR Name	Through 01/28/06 Call Signs with Reconfiguration Applications Granted	Nextel Clears Frequencies	Incumbent Clears Frequencies	Through 01/28/06 Call Signs with Surrender Applications Submitted to FCC	Through 01/28/06 Call Signs with Surrender Applications Granted	Reconfiguration Certification Verified by TA
		Number of Call Signs					
51	TX - Houston	6	6	5	4	2	0
52	TX - Lubbock	11	10	4	2	2	0
Wave 3	Subtotal	20	14	9	5	5	1
1	Alabama	3	1	1	0	0	0
9	Florida	8	7	6	4	4	1
10	Georgia	0	0	0	0	0	0
18	Louisiana	1	2	0	0	0	0
23	Mississippi	5	2	1	0	0	0
31	North Carolina	3	2	1	1	1	0
37	South Carolina	0	0	0	0	0	0
Wave 4	Subtotal	18	14	10	6	3	1
2	Alaska*	1	0	0	0	0	0
3	Arizona*	5	4	3	2	1	0
5	CA - South*	1	1	1	1	0	0
21	Michigan*	0	0	0	0	0	0
29	New Mexico*	1	1	0	0	0	0
30	NY - Albany*	1	1	1	0	0	0
33	Ohio*	2	0	0	0	0	0
36	Pennsylvania*	0	0	0	0	0	0
43	Washington*	3	3	3	2	1	1
50	TX - El Paso*	3	3	1	0	0	0
53	TX - San Antonio*	1	1	1	1	1	0
54	MI portion of Chicago*	0	0	0	0	0	0
55	New York - Buffalo*	0	0	0	0	0	0
61	Gulf of Mexico	0	0	0	0	0	0
62	Marianas	0	0	0	0	0	0
63	Guam	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total for Waves 1-4		445	403	236	131	105	8

Appendix 7
Status of Reconfiguration for Licensees in Channels 1-120:
Milestones Completed by Number of Call Signs, Per Wave, Per Region, as of January 28, 2006

Public Safety Region	PSR Name	Updated Call Sign Population as of 12/31/05	Nextel Initiated Contact with Licensee	Nextel and Licensee Reach Pre-Contract Agreement	Nextel Submits Frequency Reconfiguration Agreement to TA	TA Approves Frequency Reconfiguration Agreement	Through 01/28/06 Call Signs with Reconfiguration Applications Submitted to FCC
		Number of Call Signs					

Notes:

- a. Data for Channel 1-120 call signs does not include call signs in Wave 1 and Wave 2 that were under contract with Nextel prior to the start of reconfiguration and for which contracts are not going to be submitted to the TA for review and approval for Nextel credit.
- b. Data includes call signs in the international border area. Data may change depending on treaty negotiation outcomes.
- c. The current population of call signs has been adjusted for call signs cancelled without a Frequency Reconfiguration Agreement (FRA), and incremented for any call signs added through pending applications. Licensees may independently cancel licenses or let them expire without entering into an FRA. TA, Nextel and industry outreach efforts may also contribute to encouraging licensees not longer using licenses to unilaterally cancel them.
- d. Data includes call signs with fixed locations authorized for frequencies the 851-854 MHz range with adequate geographic data to determine a Public Safety Region.
- e. Data for the call sign population and applications may not match data for Nextel milestones due to call signs expiring or being cancelled without contracts. Also, certain FRAs may include call signs undergoing reconfiguration that may be cancelled or assigned without frequencies being changed.

Appendix 8

Stakeholder Outreach Activities: Meetings and Conferences Attended by TA Representatives For Quarter Ended December 31, 2005

October 2005:

Texas APCO 2005 State Conference
Northern California Chapter of APCO (NAPCO) Chapter Meeting
EWA 2005 Annual Conference
CIPRA Meeting
Florida APCO Business Meeting
South Carolina APCO/NENA Chapter Meeting

November 2005:

Northern California Chapter of APCO (NAPCO) Chapter Meeting
CIPRA Meeting
NPSTC Committee and Governing Board Meeting
Georgia APCO Fall Training

December 2005:

CPRA Meeting
NAPCO Chapter Meeting
National League of Cities
UTC 800MHz Rebanding Seminar

Appendix 9
800 MHz Transition Administrator, LLC Fees and Expenses through December 31, 2005

	Quarter Ending Dec. 31, 2004	Quarter Ending March 31, 2005	Quarter Ending June 30, 2005	Quarter Ending Sept. 30, 2005	Quarter Ending Dec. 31, 2005	Year-to-Date through Dec. 31, 2005	Inception-to- Date through Dec. 31, 2005
Fees:							
Reconfiguration Management	\$399,022	\$974,146	\$1,171,712	\$1,638,990	\$1,729,787	\$5,108,903	\$5,341,525
Frequency Management *			621,963	701,969	640,444	2,390,906	2,557,306
Financial Management	15,910	262,230	723,581	672,505	613,011	2,260,927	2,276,837
General Counsel/Regulatory Management	522,842	1,188,332	1,180,231	1,201,415	1,812,203	5,281,543	5,804,385
Stakeholder Relationship Management	302,317	841,174	1,438,620	1,274,016	1,259,955	4,813,764	5,116,081
TA Systems Support	112,202	668,970	1,237,954	1,198,184	713,299	3,808,007	3,920,209
Program Management Support	210,034	731,626	797,787	735,483	583,115	2,848,011	3,058,045
<i>Subtotal</i>	\$1,562,327	\$4,666,478	\$7,171,847	\$7,422,562	\$7,351,813	\$26,512,062	\$28,074,389
Expenses:	\$32,138	\$190,259	\$420,822	\$495,393	\$294,174	\$1,501,285	\$1,533,423
Total Labor and Expenses	\$1,594,465	\$4,856,737	\$7,592,669	\$7,917,955	\$7,645,986	\$28,013,347	\$29,607,812

* During the quarters ending December 31, 2004 and March 31, 2005, all Frequency Management fees were reported under the Reconfiguration Management functional team.